

PROCEEDINGS

Thirty-Second Anniversary Conference

**National Association of Deans
and Advisers of Men**

**Williamsburg Lodge
and the
College of William and Mary**

WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

March 15, 16, 17, 18

1950

P R O C E E D I N G S

Thirty-Second Anniversary Conference

of the

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF

DEANS AND ADVISERS

OF MEN

President Dean L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College
Vice-President Dean J. J. Somerville, Ohio Wesleyan
University
Vice-President Dean Dean Newhouse, Case Institute of
Technology
Secretary-Treasurer .. Dean Fred H. Turner, University of Illinois
Executive Committee - The Officers and

Dean J. H. Newman, University of Alabama

Dean M. E. Jarchow, Carleton College

Dean F. C. Baldwin, Cornell University

Associate Dean W. B. Rea, University of Michigan

Dean Juan Reid, Colorado College

Dean F. H. Weaver, University of North Carolina

Held at
Williamsburg Lodge
and the
College of William and Mary

Williamsburg, Virginia
March 15, 16, 17, 18, 1950

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P a g e

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

March 15, 1950

Invocation	1
Address of Welcome - J. Wilfred Lambert	1
President's Address - Dean Neidlinger	3
Address - "The Qualities of an Administrator" Chester I. Barnard	20
Discussion of Mr. Barnard's Address	21
Announcements	28
Briefing for Workshop No. I, "Student Government" - Donald M. DuShane	30

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

March 16, 1950

Announcements	38
Briefing for Workshop No. II, "Administration of Student Personnel Programs" - A. Blair Knapp	38

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

March 16, 1950

Announcements	45
Briefing for Workshop No. III, "Counseling" - Willard W. Blaesser	46

THURSDAY EVENING SESSION

March 16, 1950

Briefing for Workshop No. IV, "Discipline" - S. H. Goodnight	55
---	----

TABLE OF CONTENTSP a g e**FRIDAY MORNING SESSION**

March 17, 1950

**Reports of Chairmen of Groups on Workshop
No. I, "Student Government" -**

Group 1 - E. L. Hawthorne	67
Group 2 - Frank J. Gilliam	69
Group 3 - E. H. Rece	70
Group 4 - C. E. Deakins	73
Group 5 - Erich A. Walter	74

**Reports of Chairmen of Groups on Workshop
No. II, "Administration of Student
Personnel Programs" -**

Group 5 - T. W. Biddle	78
Group 4 - W. L. Penberthy	80
Group 3 - John F. Quinn	84
Group 2 - Joe N. Gerber	84
Group 1 - Eby C. Espenshade	86

Reports of Luncheon Meetings	90
------------------------------------	----

Announcements re Convention Picture	93
---	----

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

March 17, 1950

**Reports of Chairmen of Groups on Workshop
No. III, "Counseling" -**

Group 1 - E. M. Tate	94
Group 2 - Robert E. Bates	96
Group 3 - L. Gray Burdin	99
Group 4 - L. E. Woodruff	101
Group 5 - Robert W. Bishop	102

TABLE OF CONTENTSP a g e

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION (Continued)

Reports of Chairmen of Groups on Workshop
No. IV, "Discipline" -

Group 4 - Otis McBride	105
Group 5 - H. E. Stone	109
Group 3 - F. R. B. Godolphin	112
Group 2 - Richard C. Burts	114
Group 1 - R. D. Hassler	116

Annual Business Meeting -	119
---------------------------	-----

Report of Resolutions Committee	
Resolution No. 1	119
Resolution No. 2	120
Resolution No. 3	120
Resolution No. 4	120
Resolution No. 5	121
Resolution No. 6	121
Resolution No. 7	122
Resolution No. 8	123
Resolution No. 9	123

Report of Committee on Nominations ..	124
Election of Officers	125
Report of Committee on Time and Place	126

Old and New Business	128
----------------------------	-----

Remarks - President Neidlinger	128
--------------------------------------	-----

Introduction of Newly Elected Officers ...	129
--	-----

Adjournment	129
-------------------	-----

BANQUET SESSION

March 17, 1950

Introduction of Guests	130
------------------------------	-----

Address -

Doctor John E. Pomfret	133
Doctor Paul M. Gross	139

TABLE OF CONTENTSP a g e

APPENDIX A

Report of the Secretary	150
Report of the Treasurer	153

APPENDIX B

Roster of Attendance at Williamsburg Meeting.	155
---	-----

APPENDIX C

Roster of Ladies Group	161
------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX D

Summary of Previous Meetings	162
------------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX E

Roster of Members	163
Emeritus Deans	170
Honorary Members	170

P R O G R A M

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

9:00 A.M. Registration - Maine Lounge, Williamsburg Lodge

9:00 A.M. Preparation of Wire Recordings - Room B, Williamsburg Lodge. Dictators will report to the Recording Machine Room as soon as possible after arrival to record their statements. Announcement will be made in assemblies as to arrangements for individuals to hear the recordings. Statements have been made by seven recording teams on the following pertinent topics:

Teams of Dictators

I. RELATIONS WITH PARENTS

1. Dean E. L. Cloyd, North Carolina State College.
2. Dean J. H. Newman, University of Alabama.
3. Counselor Roland F. McGuigan, Northwestern Univ.
4. Dean E. E. Stafford, University of Illinois.
5. Dean Robert M. Strozier, University of Chicago.

II. COMMUTORS' PROBLEMS

1. Dean J. W. Biddle, University of Pittsburgh.
2. Dean Robert W. Bishop, University of Cincinnati.
3. Dean H. W. Melvin, Northeastern University.
4. Dean V. F. Spathelf, Wayne University.
5. Dean H. E. Stone, University of California.
6. Dean E. G. Williamson, University of Minnesota.

III. DISCRIMINATION

1. Dean W. D. Holdeman, Oberlin College.
2. Dean Waldo Shumway, Stevens Institute of Technology.
3. Asst. Dean George M. Street, University of Miss.
4. Dean Paul L. Trump, University of Wisconsin
5. Dean Erich A. Walter, University of Michigan.

IV. DEFERRED RUSHING

1. Dean J. L. Bostwick, Allegheny College.
2. Dean J. A. Dickinson, Carnegie Institute of Technology.
3. Dean Everett Hunt, Swarthmore College.
4. Asso. Dean W. B. Rea, University of Michigan.
5. Dean E. E. Wieman, University of Maine.

V. HEALTH SERVICES

1. Dean J. G. Allen, Texas Technological Institute.
2. Dean Forrest D. Brown, Fresno State College.
3. Dean Clarence E. Deakins, Illinois Institute of Tech.
4. Dean Merrill E. Jarchow, Carleton College.
5. Dean Wesley P. Lloyd, Brigham Young University.
6. Mr. Tom King, Michigan State College.

VI. FRATERNITY INITIATIONS

1. Dean C. B. Boocock, Rutgers University.
2. Asst. Dean Lester Brailey, University of Pittsburgh.
3. Dean Donald M. DuShane, University of Oregon.
4. Dean Frank R. Hunt, Lafayette College.
5. Dean J. J. Somerville, Ohio Wesleyan University.

VII. THEFTS AND FORGERIES

1. Dean Robert E. Bates, Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
2. Dean J. F. Daugherty, University of Delaware.
3. Dean George E. Davis, Purdue University.
4. Dean F. R. B. Godolphin, Princeton University.
5. Dean Dean Newhouse, Case Institute of Technology.

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

10:30 A.M. Meeting of Executive Committee - Studio Room,
Williamsburg Lodge.

12:00 M. Luncheon - Main Dining Room.

1:30 P.M. Opening Session of 32nd Anniversary Conference - Game
Room, Williamsburg Lodge, Dean L. K. Neidlinger,
Dartmouth College, presiding.

Invocation - Dean Garner E. Hubbell, The Principia.

Welcome - J. Wilfred Lambert, Dean of Students, College
William and Mary.

President's Address - Dean Neidlinger.

- 2:30 P.M. Address - "The Qualities of An Administrator," Mr. Chester I. Barnard, President, the Rockefeller Foundation; President, the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company. Discussion of Mr. Barnard's Address.
- 3:30 P.M. Assembly - Game Room, Williamsburg Lodge.
Briefing for Workshop No. I, "Student Government."
Counselor - Dean Donald M. DuShane, University of Oregon.
- 4:00 P.M. Workshop No. I, "Student Government."
See Chart on Page viii for Group Assignments, Places of Group Meetings, Chairmen, Recorders, and Experts.
- 6:00 P.M. Dinner, Main Dining Room, Williamsburg Lodge.
- 7:15 P.M. Assembly - Reception Center, Colonial Williamsburg.
Welcome - Dr. John E. Pomfret, President, The College of William and Mary.
"The Restoration of Colonial Williamsburg and Its Purpose," Mr. Vernon Geddy, Trustee of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., and Director of Williamsburg, Inc.
Color Film - "Eighteenth Century Life in Williamsburg."
- 8:30 P.M. Candlelight Tour of the Restored Colonial Capitol, meeting place of the Virginia Assembly and General Court.
- 10:00 P.M. Reception - Game Room, Williamsburg Lodge; selections by the William and Mary Choir, directed by Mr. W. Warren Sprouse; Conference as guests of the College of William and Mary.

Thursday, March 16, 1950

- 8:00 A.M. Registration Continued - Main Lounge, Williamsburg Lodge.
- 9:00 A.M. Assembly - Game Room, Williamsburg Lodge.
Briefing for Workshop No. II, "Administration of Student Personnel Programs."
Counselor - Vice President A. Blair Knapp, Temple Univ.
- 9:30 A.M. Workshop No. II, "Administration of Student Personnel Programs." See Chart on Page ix for Group numbers, Places of Group Meetings, Chairmen, Recorders, & Experts.

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

GROUPS		WORKSHOP NO. I
<u>Meeting Places</u>	<u>Leaders</u>	<u>Student Government</u>
GROUP 1	Time:	4:00 P.M. Wednesday , March 15
Institutions with up to 1,000 students	Chairmen:	Dean Edward L. Hawthorne Alfred University
WEST ROOM	Recorders:	Dean E. M. Carter Park College
Chowning's Tavern	Experts:	Dean F. E. Weyer Hastings College
GROUP 2	Chairmen:	Dean Frank J. Gilliam Washington & Lee Univ.
Institutions with 1,001 to 2,000 students	Recorders:	Asso. Dean Paul C. Eaton Calif. Institute of Tech.
LIVING ROOM	Experts:	Dean John A. Guy Illinois Wesleyan Univ.
Market Square Tavern		Dean Barrett Hollister Antioch College Dean Frank R. Hunt Lafayette College
GROUP 3	Chairmen:	Dean E. H. Rece Emory University
Institutions with 2,001 to 5,000 students	Recorders:	Dean A. L. Keeney University of Wyoming
GAME ROOM	Experts:	Dean Dean Newhouse Case Institute of Tech.
Williamsburg Lodge		Dean Malcolm E. Musser Bucknell University Dean C. A. Sevrinson North Dak. Agric. Col.
GROUP 4	Chairmen:	Dean Clarence E. Deakins Illinois Institute of Tech.
Institutions with 5,001 to 10,000 students	Recorders:	Dean T. P. Pitre Mass. Institute of Tech.
WEST DINING ROOM	Experts:	Dean A. D. Kirwan University of Kentucky
Williamsburg Inn		Dean James G. Allen Texas Technological Col. Director Philip Price University of Rochester

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

GROUPS		WORKSHOP NO. I	
<u>Meeting Places</u>	<u>Leaders</u>	<u>Student Government</u>	
GROUP 5	Chairmen:	Dean Erich A. Walter University of Michigan	
Institutions with 10,001 or more students	Recorders:	Dean Harold W. Melvin Northeastern University	
	Experts:	Dean Frank C. Baldwin Cornell University	
GAME ROOM		Dean Paul L. Trump University of Wisconsin	
Williamsburg Inn		Dean O. D. Roberts University of Oklahoma	
		WORKSHOP NO. II	
		<u>Administration of Student Personnel Programs</u>	
GROUP 1	Time:	9:30 A.M. Thursday, March 16	
Institutions with up to 1,000 students	Chairmen:	Dean Eby C. Espenshade Elizabethtown College	
	Recorders:	Director Philip Price University of Rochester	
WEST ROOM	Experts:	Dean Harry A. Brandt University of Alaska	
Chowning's Tavern			
GROUP 2	Chairmen:	Dean Joe N. Gerber Northwestern College	
Institutions with 1,001 to 2,000 students	Recorders:	Dean George K. Brown St. Lawrence University	
	Experts:	V. Pres. J. H. Julian Univ. of South Dakota	
LIVING ROOM		Dean L. E. Chandler Southeastern College	
Market Square Tavern		Dean Everett Hunt Swarthmore College	
GROUP 3	Chairmen:	Dean John F. Quinn Rhode Island State College	
Institutions with 2,001 to 5,000 Students	Recorders:	Director D. W. Miner Carnegie Institute of Tech.	
	Experts:	Dean D. H. Gardner University of Akron	
GAME ROOM		Dean Robert W. Kenny Brown University	
Williamsburg Lodge		Dean Wray H. Congdon Lehigh University	

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

GROUPS		WORKSHOP NO. II <u>Administration of Student Personnel Programs</u>	
GROUP 4			
Institutions with 5,001 to 10,000 students	Chairmen:	Dean W. L. Penberthy Texas A. & M. College	
	Recorders:	Dean John H. Stibbs Tulane University	
WEST DINING ROOM Williamsburg Inn	Experts:	Dean Robert M. Strozier University of Chicago Dean Foster E. Alter University of Miami Dean Willis Tate Southern Methodist Univ.	
GROUP 5			
	Chairmen:	Dean T. W. Biddle University of Pittsburgh	
Institutions with 10,001 or more students	Recorders:	Dean Cornelius B. Boocock Rutgers University	
	Experts:	Dean J. A. Park Ohio State University Dean T. J. Thompson University of Nebraska Dean V. F. Spathelf Wayne University	
GAME ROOM Williamsburg Inn			
GROUP 1		WORKSHOP NO. III <u>Counseling</u>	
	Time:	2:30 P.M. Thursday, March 16	
Institutions with up to 1,000 students	Chairmen:	Dean E. M. Tate Hanover College	
	Recorders:	Dean Clinton B. Gass Nebraska Wesleyan University	
WEST ROOM Chowning's Tavern	Experts:	Dean Melvin A. Anderson Hiram College	
GROUP 2			
	Chairmen:	Dean Robert E. Bates Virginia Polytechnic Inst.	
Institutions with 1,001 to 2,000 students	Recorders:	Dean W. E. Marshall East Car. St. Teachers Col.	
	Experts:	Dean Merrill E. Jarchow Carleton College Dean Victor T. Trusler Kansas State Teachers Col. Dean Frank W. Clippinger Drury College	
LIVING ROOM Market Square Tavern			

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

 WORKSHOP NO. III
Counseling

GROUP 3

Institutions with 2,001 to 5,000 students GAME ROOM Williamsburg Lodge	Chairmen: Dean Will Hays Santa Barbara College Recorders: Dean L. Gray Burdin Butler University Experts: Dean Waldo Shumway Stevens Institute of Tech. Dean Maurel Hunkins Ohio University
--	---

GROUP 4

Institutions with 5,001 to 10,000 students WEST DINING ROOM Williamsburg Inn	Chairmen: Dean Laurence C. Woodruff University of Kansas Recorders: Dean R. E. Manchester Kent State University Experts: Dean Arden O. French Louisiana State University Asst. Dean William Friday University of North Carolina
--	--

GROUP 5

Institutions with 10,001 or more students GAME ROOM Williamsburg Inn	Chairmen: Dean Robert W. Bishop University of Cincinnati Recorders: Dean Geary Eppley University of Maryland Experts: Dean Arno Nowotny University of Texas Dean Arno J. Haack Washington University Dean C. M. Farrington George Washington University
--	--

 WORKSHOP NO. IV
Discipline

GROUP 1

Institutions with up to 1,000 students WEST ROOM Chowning's Tavern	Time: 8:00 P.M. Thursday, March 16 Chairmen: Dean R. D. Hassler Moravian College Recorders: Dean J. F. Jansen Carroll College Experts: Dean G. E. Hubbell The Principia
--	---

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

		WORKSHOP NO. IV
		<u>Discipline</u>
GROUP 2		
Institutions with 1,001 to 2,000 students	Chairmen:	Dean Richard C. Burts, Jr. Mercer University
	Recorders:	Director Maurice Galbraith U. of Illinois Prof. Col.
LIVING ROOM Market Square Tavern	Experts:	Vice Pres. J. J. Thompson St. Olaf College Dean J. L. Bostwick Allegheny College Dean Richard C. Burts Mercer University
GROUP 3	Chairmen:	Dean F. R. D. Godolphin Princeton University
Institutions with 2,001 to 5,000 students	Recorders:	Dean Robert S. Waldrop Vanderbilt University
	Experts:	Dean E. L. Cloyd North Carolina St. College Dean J. J. Somerville Ohio Wesleyan University Dean William Hazell Newark College of Engrg.
GAME ROOM Williamsburg Lodge		
GROUP 4	Chairmen:	Dean Otis McBride Florida State University
Institutions with 5,001 to 10,000 students	Recorders:	Dean Wesley P. Lloyd Brigham Young University
	Experts:	Dean J. H. Newman University of Alabama Dean Robert Miner Miami University Dean George C. Griffin Georgia Institute of Tech.
WEST DINING ROOM Williamsburg Inn		
GROUP 5	Chairmen:	Dean H. E. Stone University of California
Institutions with 10,001 or more students	Recorders:	Asst. Dir. Donald Mallett Purdue University
	Experts:	Dean S. E. Crowe Michigan State College Asso. Dean W. B. Rea University of Michigan Dean Bernard Hyink University of Southern Cal.
GAME ROOM Williamsburg Inn		

Thursday, March 16, 1950

12:00 M. Luncheon - Main Dining Room, Williamsburg Lodge.

Tables by announced topics with Moderators to preside at each table. Places for twelve at each table. Sign up in advance at the registration desk for your choice of topic. (Names listed are Moderators.)

1. Fraternity Scholarship--Dean J. F. Daugherty, University of Delaware.
2. Fraternity Rushing--Dean Richard C. Burts, Mercer Univ.
3. Fraternity Finances--Dean H. K. Wilson, Pennsylvania State College.
4. Fraternity Policies--Dean J. A. Park, Ohio State Univ.
5. Independents, Financing--Dean Darold Shutt, Marshall Col.
6. Independents, Social Problems--Dean Arno Nowotny, University of Texas.
7. Student Aid--Dean, Emeritus, J. A. Bursley, University of Michigan.
8. Publications--Acting Dean Rolf N. B. Haugen, University of Vermont.
9. Orientation, Coordination--Asst. Director Stanley Benz, Purdue University.
10. Orientation, New Problems--Jr. Dean Wm. S. Guthrie, Ohio State University.
11. Cheating--Assistant Dean L. Dale Faunce, Michigan State College.
12. Terminal Counseling--Dean Arch B. Conklin, Bowling Green State University.
13. Social Events Management--Asst. Dean C. G. White, Texas A. & M. College.
14. National Students' Association--Dean Dean Newhouse, Case Institute of Technology.
15. Housing--Asst. Dean George M. Street, University of Mississippi.
16. Student Employment--Dean R. C. Beaty, Univ. of Florida.
17. Student Placement--Dean W. J. Farrisee, Clarkson College of Technology.
18. Deans of Women--Dean Frank C. Baldwin, Cornell University

2:00 P.M. Assembly - Game Room, Williamsburg Lodge.

Briefing for Workshop No. III, "Counseling."

Counselor--Willard W. Blaesser, Specialist for Student Personnel Programs, U. S. Office of Education.

Thursday, March 16, 1950 (Continued)

2:30 P.M. Workshop No. III, "Counseling."

See Chart on Page x for Group Numbers, Places of Group Meetings, Chairmen, Recorders, and Experts

4:30 P.M. Demonstration of IBM Equipment in Dean of Students', Registrar's, and Dean of Men's Offices.

Dean J. W. Lambert, and Dean John E. Hocutt of the College of William and Mary have arranged for an exhibit and demonstration of the special uses which they are making of their IBM equipment.

If you wish to attend this special session, sign up in advance at the Registration Desk.

6:00 P.M. Dinner - Main Dining Room, Williamsburg Lodge.

7:30 P.M. Assembly - Game Room, Williamsburg Lodge.

Briefing for Workshop No. IV, "Discipline."

Counselor - Dean, Emeritus, Scott H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin.

8:00 P.M. Workshop No. IV, "Discipline."

See Chart on Page xi for Group Numbers, Places of Group Meetings, Chairmen, Recorders, and Experts.

Friday, March 17, 1950

8:00 A.M. Registration Continued - Main Lounge, Williamsburg Lodge.

9:00 A.M. Assembly - Game Room, Williamsburg Lodge, Dean Neidlinger presiding.

Reports of Chairmen of Groups 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 on Workshop No. I, "Student Government."

10:00 A.M. Reports of Chairmen of Groups 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 on Workshop No. II, "Administration of Student Personnel Programs."

11:00 A.M. Convention Photograph - Gardens of Governor's Palace.

12:00 M. Luncheon - Main Dining Room, Williamsburg Lodge.
(Tables by topics if Conference desires.)

Friday, March 17, 1950 (Continued)

1:30 P.M. Assembly - Game Room, Williamsburg Lodge.

Reports of Chairmen of Groups 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 on Workshop No. III, Counseling."

2:30 P.M. Reports of Chairmen of Groups 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 on Workshop No. IV, "Discipline."

3:30 P.M. Annual Business Meeting - Dean Neidlinger presiding.

Report of Resolutions Committee--Dean Arno J. Haack, Chairman.

Report of Committee on Time and Place.

Report of Committee on Nominations.

Old Business.

New Business.

5:30 P.M. Adjournment of the 32nd Anniversary Conference.

7:00 P.M. Annual Banquet - Main Dining Room, Williamsburg Lodge.
(Dress optional for men; dinner dresses for ladies.)

Presiding - Dean L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College.

Toastmaster - Dean William Tate, University of Georgia.

Music - Colonial Williamsburg Quintet.

Address - "Some Trends in Higher Education," Doctor Paul M. Gross, Vice President, Duke University; President, Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies; Scientific Adviser to 1949 Paris UNESCO Conference.

Address - Doctor John E. Pomfret, President, College of William and Mary.

Saturday, March 18, 1950

9:00 A. M. Meeting of Executive Committee - Studio Room, Williamsburg Lodge.

9:00 A. M. Space can be arranged for any informal groups desiring further discussion of any topic.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

March 15, 1950

The opening session of the Thirty-Second Anniversary Convention of the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men, held March 15-17, 1950, at Williamsburg Lodge, Williamsburg, Virginia, convened at one-thirty o'clock, Dean L. K. Neidlinger of Dartmouth College, President, presiding.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Gentlemen, and any Deans who are not gentlemen: I am very glad to declare the Thirty-Second Annual Convention of this organization in session.

As is our custom and long tradition, we will have first an invocation, which will be given by Dean Garner Hubbell of The Principia.

... The assembly arose ...

DEAN GARNER E. HUBBELL (The Principia): I want you to join in a few moments of silent prayer, and join then in the concert repetition of the Lord's Prayer.

... The assembly prayed in silence ...

DEAN HUBBELL (and the assembly in unison): Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We are here, gentlemen, as I am sure most of you know, with the host college, the College of William and Mary, and I am very happy to introduce Dean J. Wilfred Lambert, who is the Dean of Students at William and Mary, to say a few words of welcome to us. Dean Lambert. [Applause]

DEAN J. WILFRED LAMBERT (College of William and Mary): Mr. President, members of NADAM, and guests: It gives me a great pleasure to welcome you to Williamsburg and to the College of William and Mary. I believe the Association has met only once before in Virginia. That was in Roanoke, some ten years ago. I am glad you have reversed the direction of migration and moved eastward.

Most people who live west of Williamsburg eventually come east to this city, if for no other reason than to find a colonial forebearer -- here, or among the small group of settlers at Jamestown in 1607.

Our librarian some years ago was noted for his extensive knowledge of early Virginia families. Few visitors to Williamsburg, in search of an ancestor, neglected the opportunity to visit him, and get a little free genealogical assistance.

One visitor, an impressive spinster who collected ancestors the way deans collect anecdotes, called on him one day to ask if he knew of a Jamestown family named Foster. Our librarian replied indeed he did. "Thomas Foster lived on Jamestown Island all his life, and was in fact buried there."

"Precisely as I had expected," cried the ancestor seeker. "And is there a stone over his grave?" she asked.

"Yes, madam," was the answer. "A stone with a clearly legible inscription."

"Then I shall go to Jamestown immediately to see it," she cooed. "Unless," she said, "the inscription is recorded here?"

"You needn't make the trip," said our librarian. "I recall the inscription and can recite it verbatim: 'Here lies Thomas Foster, a notorious rascal and a horse thief, awaiting the day of forgiveness and a joyful resurrection.'" [Laughter]

The visitor "glumped" out of the library and charged off to find an ancestor among a later, but no less well-known, group who came over on the Mayflower. [Laughter]

You will find Williamsburg and the College great places for tradition. I am sorry to say that much that we do has been done that way for a long time. Amazingly enough, the students are among the most fanatic tradition followers, especially if the tradition is patently to their favor. I have been startled to hear a custom of three or four years standing described as "an old William and Mary tradition."

You will undoubtedly encounter a number of traditions, but you will be surprised to learn that the office of the dean is by no means traditional at William and Mary. As a matter of fact, we did not have what you might call a professional dean until 1918, and we didn't have a dean of men until 1928. It embarrasses me greatly to have to say that we had a dean of women some years before that. [Laughter] But Dean Hocutt and I have scrupulously

hidden this fact from the present dean of women.

The tradition of faculty participation in the administration of the College is strong at William and Mary. But step by step we have increased the number of deans until now we can almost out-vote the faculty. To paraphrase Huey Long's famous slogan: "For every man, a dean." [Laughter]

News gets about and a few days ago we received a letter written by a very much bewildered high school student to the "Dean of Deans." [Laughter] His idea has wonderful possibilities. [Laughter]

Now, on behalf of the President, the faculty, and the administrative staff of the College, I extend to you a most hearty welcome. Much has been done in advance of your coming to make your visit a pleasant one. I say this with no feeling of immodesty, since all the arrangements have been most capably supervised by Dean Hocutt, and my only function has been that of nodding agreement to his excellent plans.

The last time we had a similar group of visitors, we set fire to our then newly constructed Science Hall. [Laughter] I promise you no such rousing welcome. But I am surprised to learn that Dean Hocutt has so thoroughly planned for your meeting that, through legerdemain rivaling the magic of an IBM operation, he has arranged for the students to have a formal dance this weekend, and it is not beyond reasonable expectation to anticipate that some students will misbehave and that the dean will be able to provide you your workshop on discipline with raw material for its session. [Laughter] What more could you ask of a conscientious host?

Thank you. [Laughter and applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Dean Lambert, we thank you for your gracious words and the sentiment behind them, and I assure you that we are looking forward to this encounter with southern hospitality.

I hope none of our members will burn down your Science Building, or try to crash your student dance, and that perhaps when we leave that we will have been found to be proper guests, and I am sure you will find that we are appreciative ones.

Now, gentlemen, it has long been customary for the president of this organization to open the annual convention

with an address. So far as I can discover my predecessors have never abused this privilege by speaking very long or saying anything of startling importance. [Laughter] I am prepared to abide by this precedent. [Laughter]

The secretary's report will make it clear to you that our organization is in excellent shape financially and is otherwise sound and solvent. Its members are cooperative, responsive, respected and respectable. Its officers are solicitous and servile to the secretary who alone and often unaided has managed every activity of this Association for longer than most of us can remember. What we are, have been, and will be, stands as a monument to Dean Fred Turner, and I can't begin to tell you the extent to which you are indebted to him, I am sure you know that. [Applause] It is interesting to speculate on what Fred might be able to do for us and to us if he didn't have to spend part of his time managing the affairs of the University of Illinois. [Laughter]

The responsibilities of the president of NADAM are inconsequential. He needs only to have sense enough to not interfere with Dean Turner's plans, practices, and policies. This has been just within my capabilities and I have enjoyed the experience of being titular head of this Association. I have done nothing, but I have thought a great deal during the past year about our organization and its dedication to the purpose of helping its members to meet the important responsibilities of their peculiar positions as deans, advisors, and counselors of young men. I have thought about the nature of the Dean's job -- about what we are trying to accomplish -- about what stops us from fulfilling our missions and accomplishing our goals.

There are some differences of opinion among us as to whether we are practitioners of a science or of an art. It is a pedantic argument. We need to be both scientific and artistic in our counseling and administrative activities. Surely our function is humanistic but the understanding of men, which in the abstract and in the particular is the talent of our trade, is not easily acquired without scientific examination and analysis of experiments and experience. We are practitioners and professionals in our academic communities but in the company of this gathering we must have the humility of those who know that there is no end to our need for the learning and the experience that we can obtain here vicariously by mutual cooperation. That is why we are here -- to learn from each other by sharing observations, exchanging ideas, defining principles, evaluating techniques, and by asking each other What, Why, Why not, and How? Old deans learn

from new deans, big university deans learn from small college deans, amateur deans learn from professionally educated deans, and vice versa.

We are about to engage in a concentrated orgy of such learning which your executive committee has attempted to make orderly by a program of conference meetings at scheduled times and places. Planning such a program is not easy. It was not made easier by the modesty of members of this Association -- a characteristic which I did not suspect until I tried to induce you to inform me of topics on which you were prepared to give help and advice. An impartial statistician tabulating the replies I received would certainly have concluded that no dean knows anything -- or dares admit it. [Laughter]

Nevertheless we have managed to draft almost everyone known to be attending this convention to serve in some capacity that will disclose his ignorance. [Laughter] The Executive Committee has unbounded confidence in you.

It is quite impossible to cover each year all of the phases of the work in which we are commonly engaged. There are no topics that are new to many of us but there are always new ideas and angles on old topics and always there is among us a substantial number of new men who missed, for example, the wonderful session on student government at Ann Arbor, the report on housing problems in 1946, and other debates and reports from previous conventions which some men here remember distinctly. The education and enlightenment of these newer deans is the most important and useful function of our organization. We want this enlightenment to go on in the conference sessions, in the lobbies, at the lunch tables, and as always, in personal conversations far into the night.

It has always been somewhat unsatisfactory to have different topics being discussed in different places at the same time, causing everyone who could not be in two places at once to miss something of interest. To avoid this we have this year arranged for the simultaneous discussion of the same topic in all workshops -- the conference being divided, as usual, into groups determined by institutional size. This arrangement reduces the number of topics that can be given extensive treatment. We selected topics in which the largest number of men in all size groups expressed interest. Other topics will be discussed at luncheon table meetings and you may select your topic and sign up for a place in the group discussing it by writing your name on the chart that will be prominently posted in the lobby this evening and tomorrow morning.

You can also improve your mind and learn how to be a dean by going to the Recording Room, just off the lobby, at any time that suits your convenience, and asking the attendants there to hook you up to one of the tape recordings that we have been busy making last night and this morning. We are conducting there an interesting new experiment in convention technique. On each of several topics we have had a team of five deans record their experience and advice -- all on the same tape. Anyone interested in these topics can pull up a chair, light a cigar, and listen at leisure to the advice of five colleagues who could not otherwise be interviewed so conveniently. He can then add his own comments by flipping a switch and talking. Furthermore, six months from now when you may have to educate a faculty committee on the facts of life about one of these topics, you will be able to write Fred Turner for the recording, borrow a machine, and bring these expert witnesses into your committee room.

I hope many of you will take time during the recess periods of the convention to visit the recording room and learn to be a dean in this easy way, or at least to learn something about wire recording equipment. Because we are considerably indebted to Mr. Mahler who is in charge there for the Radio Wire Television Corporation and who personally arranged to provide this interesting equipment for our use without expense to the Deans' Association, we owe him the courtesy of expressing interest in his product.

All parts of the program for the next few days have been planned with the idea that the exchange of information is the most important function of this gathering. We offer the chance to get your questions answered by men wrestling with problems similar to yours and in most instances by men who have licked those problems in some previous encounter. We have done four things to make the workshops work:

First: we have asked you to send specific questions to the chairmen by mail so that major problems could have priority in each discussion group.

Second: we have assigned an experienced man to brief you before each workshop starts. He will define some aspects of the topic on which agreement is so general that it would waste time to discuss them, and present other aspects of the topic that deserve special attention.

Third: We have provided a panel of experts, so-called, who will have first crack at all questions and offer a skeleton of

opinions on which general discussion can build substance.

Fourth: we have directed the chairmen of these workshops to be politely brutal in using the gavel on anyone who takes the floor to make a speech which is not directed to the point under discussion or which just glorifies the system in use at Old Siwash without contributing pertinent information or opinion.

In view of these precautions I want now to urge the Deans, who have been members of this Association for so many years as to be satiated with the wisdom of countless conventions, to take an active part in the discussions and to make their experience freely and fully available to the younger men who are meeting for the first time problems on which you may feel have long ago been solved and settled. One of the pertinent criticisms of previous conventions made to the Executive Committee this year was that the Old Guard seemed to make little effort to participate and contribute to discussions or to admit new men into their companionship.

I want to give emphasis to my urging that the opportunities to exchange information be used by old deans and new deans fully -- and at the same time take the curse of seriousness from this address by ending it gracefully -- by telling you another anecdote about my old friend in Vermont whose cupidity I illustrated last year with a tale about his trading an egg for a needle plus premiums. Like many of our Vermont neighbors, Will Cross uses few words to express feelings but those he does use are strictly to the point. A few years ago a city feller bought an old house down the road a piece from Will's farm and fixed it up to retire into. Not long after he had moved his stuff up from New York and settled into the old house, he walked down to the store to buy a cigar and look for some sociability. Old Will was just coming off the porch of the store when his neighbor greeted him with a bow and a smile full of cordiality and anticipation. "Well, well, Mr. Cross," he exclaimed. "How do you do and how are you this lovely morning?" I don't think it is true, as some say, that Will spit a stream of juice across his new neighbor's white sneakers, but it is well authenticated that his reply was, "None of your God-damned business." [Laughter] But after he had gone on a few steps he called back as an afterthought to say, "And Mister if you wan't a neighbor of mine I wouldn't tell you that much." [Laughter]

Don't be that way, gentlemen, let us all tell everything we know to anyone who asks us -- and if you will do that I am sure

that we will go home at the end of this convention wiser men and happier men because of our attendance here.

Thank you. [Applause]

Now, gentlemen, we have as our guest and key-note speaker this afternoon Mr. Chester I. Barnard, President of the Rockefeller Foundation. Mr. Barnard's appearance on this program is an act of personal graciousness which has no connection whatsoever with the fact that he is the executive head of a great foundation which annually gives millions of dollars to deserving institutions, and we are all connected with institutions that are annually looking for millions of dollars. [Laughter]

Our invitation was extended to him in recognition of his reputation as a scholar and author in the field of personnel management. Honesty requires me to admit that when I first proposed securing Mr. Barnard as our speaker neither I nor any member of the Executive Committee knew that he had some months previously resigned the presidency of the New Jersey Telephone Company and changed his business association. It is a great compliment to us that Mr. Barnard, who receives and is obliged to reject hundreds of invitations to address important organizations, consented to come down from New York to speak to us today.

A graduate of Harvard, and recipient of more than a handful of honorary degrees from prominent universities, Mr. Barnard some years ago gave a notable series of lectures for the Lowell Institute in Boston and later expanded these into a book which the Harvard Press published in 1938 under the title, "The Functions of the Executive." I was fortunate enough to be introduced to this valuable reference by a friend who teaches a course in Administration at Dartmouth. At the time I was trying to figure out what Authority was, where it came from, and how I could lay my hands on enough of it to control the activities of several thousand seemingly irresponsible Dartmouth students. From Mr. Barnard's book I learned so many important things about authority, influence, and power; about the characteristics of organizations, the conditions essential to cooperative activity, and the process of decision -- that I have used this book as a bible and preached its teachings as a disciple for the last ten years. I do not know now how I managed to act the part of a college dean for some previous years knowing so little of the processes by which executive functions are performed.

My experience, as well as Mr. Barnard's reputation,

allows me to present him to you with confidence that there is no member of this audience who will not profit from giving close attention and careful thought to whatever he has chosen to say to us this afternoon.

It is a great pleasure to be able to introduce Mr. Chester I. Barnard. [Applause]

[NOTE: The following address is reproduced without the benefit of editing or re-writing by Mr. Barnard.]

MR. CHESTER I. BARNARD (President, Rockefeller Foundation): President Neidlinger, gentlemen: If one talks about organization, management, administration, training, education, or personnel work, one inevitably has to approach the subject from a great many different angles. The only advantage of that, that I know of, is that if you are assigned a title in any part of the field it is sufficient to enable you to talk about any other aspect of it and still be on the subject.

I think the title is a little bit different than the one that I would have stated, because President Neidlinger asked me to talk on the subject of "Authority."

My views on the subject of authority, at the time they were announced, I don't suppose were original but they certainly were not orthodox, because I have insisted that the fundamental theory of authority, as it came to me very gradually from experience, is that all authority comes from the bottom and never comes from the top.

Since exposing my views in that way, I have had considerable additional experience, both in public efforts of various kinds as well as in business, and I still insist that authority comes from the bottom and never comes from the top. Now, unhappily, no one wants to believe it, and I suppose the myth that authority comes from the top is responsible for more difficulty in international and national affairs, and in schools, businesses and homes, than arises from any other single source.

You may recall that Tolstoy in his "War and Peace" makes the statement that practically none of Napoleon's orders in his Russian campaign were carried out, and he attached to his novel a series of appendixes, in at least one of which he develops that thesis. He, at least, was imbued with the idea that authority came from the bottom and not from the top. I am stressing this so that you will see this is not nonsense.

In 1946, when they opened up the Air War College, I was invited to come down to give a lecture on organization or management. They have used various titles for the same thing. My audience was about 100 colonels and generals, all of whom had just come out of the active war where they were directing the activities of men under great stress.

These men of course were imbued, I thought, with the legalistic position that authority comes from the top-- in this case, from Congress in the form of the Articles of War. I debated for some time -- since I was to be subject to an hour's cross-examination after this lecture -- whether I would play my line right down the middle, regardless of the audience.

The commanding officer of the College was Orvil C. Anderson, who commanded the Division in France under General Spaatz. He is a hard-hitting, hard-talking guy, full of backbone and courage. He is the man who had been highest in the atmosphere. He made that famous balloon ascent of 35,000 feet, I think in 1935 or along in there.

When I had finished my lecture, in which I talked about authority coming from the bottom, fundamentally, and not from the top, he jumped up, and I said, "Oh-oh, here she comes," and what he said to these fellows is, "What this man is talking about, is what we have been trying to get into your system for the last month."

It is almost incredible to me that a military man could accept that position, because in overt behavior in so far as orders, rank and prestige are concerned, the illusion is not only created but must be created that authority comes from the top. Now I am going to talk a little bit about why it doesn't, and then swing into the related subject of responsibility, and then make a few remarks upon the also related subject of persuasion.

Let us deal first with some of the subjective aspects of authority. If you transmit an instruction or an order to somebody that he or she cannot understand, it obviously cannot have any authority. You can't get anything done unless you are able to communicate it. Perhaps at least fifty per cent of the art of communication lies in the listener, the recipient of the instruction.

Now that is not just a theoretical proposition. A friend of mine, whose name I have forgotten for the moment, a psychologist who is head of the Psychology Department at

Brown University, believe it or not, was employed, among other things during the war, to work up a list of command orders for use on submarines, because the Navy experienced some rather serious accidents because commands were misunderstood. Of course the conditions in the operating submarines for sending commands by telephone were very unfavorable because of the great deal of noise; and what my friend found out was that much of the standard language used by the Navy in transmitting navigating orders was susceptible of misinterpretation and was ambiguous, particularly under adverse noise conditions. So a civilian was entrusted with the task of making it possible for authority to be exercised by the use of language that could be understood by those to whom orders were to be transmitted.

There is another aspect of authority of which Tolstoy was well aware, and that is, the recipient of an instruction or an order has got to be able to carry it out.

Many of Napoleon's orders were incapable of being carried out. He didn't know what he was talking about, in other words. He would order a brigade to take a hill where there was no hill. A brigade cannot take a hill if there isn't one there.

You will find all through the business world, and I think through the educational world, if you look carefully enough, case after case where instructions are given in good faith, which are so irrelevant to the actual concrete situation that they can't possibly be carried out, and frequently they are not. Some effort is made to camouflage the failure, to save at least the boss' face and perhaps save some so-called disciplinary action, but for the most part I don't think any effort whatever is made. The thing just becomes a dead letter. If you want to examine a great deal of the printed, formal instructions that are said to be in effect in all kinds of organizations -- military, business and others -- you will always find a very considerable part of them that are not in effect and that are not followed. They are either not relevant or people don't like to follow them, or they don't do it.

Let me give you a concrete, recent illustration. There was a very bad train accident on the Long Island railroad recently -- failure of an electric locomotive driver to obey a signal. The District Attorney went into the record of rule violations of all the engineers on the Long Island railroad, through a considerable period of time, and there were only six out of the entire complement of engineers on that railroad who were not guilty of violation of the rules, and many of them were guilty of numerous

violations of the rules with respect to the operation of that railroad.

That struck me as extraordinarily significant, because the discipline in the railroad business, despite the fact that it is a highly unionized business and sometimes has very unpleasant union reactions, the discipline in the railroad business, I think, is stricter than in almost any other that I know of except perhaps in power house operations or in certain types of chemical plants.

A number of years ago I was dining out on the main line, outside of Philadelphia, and among the guests was the division superintendent of the railroad for that division. You may recall that there is a long grade of several miles from Philadelphia, so that a steam locomotive, particularly one carrying a long train of freight cars, is apt to make a good deal of noise as it goes up. I suppose, like any other railroad man, his ear was always cocked to what you could hear going on in the railroad, and he heard a freight train going up the grade with one valve not working -- chug-chug-chug, chug-chug-chug. It was interesting to see him immediately call up the roundhouse and find out who was the man who hustled that engineer, and the next day that man was in his office at nine o'clock and fined two weeks' pay because of the defective character of one of the cylinders. That is how strict that discipline is.

Yet, on the Long Island railroad, where it is a matter of life and death, practically the entire organization was guilty of violating the rules.

People become quite expert in knowing what orders or what rules not to pay attention to -- in the Army, the Navy, and in business organizations. They learn what is really important, and, for the most part, what people are willing to do depends upon their sense of what is fit to do.

Then you come to the general question of willingness to take orders. That is certainly a subjective aspect of this thing. There is a great deal of willingness to take orders because if you operate on your own you accept responsibility, and a very important characteristic of most human beings is the desire to avoid responsibility. One of the most important jobs that an executive has to perform is to refuse to permit a subordinate to throw the responsibility back on him, when it ought to be delegated to the men. You have to be on guard against that all the time. Most people are perfectly willing -- anxious -- to have you tell them

what to do rather than to take the responsibility of making their own decision. So there is a very great deal of desire for authority on the part of most human beings in most conditions.

Another very important aspect of executive work is the creation of what I have called "the zone of indifference" on the part of people in an organization -- indifference with respect to whether they are ordered here, or ordered there, or ordered some other place.

The wise executive, the fellow who wants to maintain inviolate what he calls formal authority, coming from the top, is exceedingly careful that he does not try to get things done very much outside the zone of indifference. The man who is not skillful about that, on one ground or another, soon finds himself out of his position because he simply cannot handle his organization. In extreme cases he is telling people to do what they cannot do, or overloading them with a multiplicity of instructions such that they become frustrated and then, like the balky horse, just lay down, and you have something on your hands to exercise authority under those conditions.

That makes me think of a little talk I had with A. Lawrence Lowell, just a year or two before he died. He was president of Harvard when I was a student there. Lowell said, "Barnard, you know, I think it is something of a misfortune in labor relations that boys are no longer raised with horses, because the boys of my day who were raised with horses just learned as children that although you are the master of the horse you just can't do much with him unless you do it in a particular way that the horse is willing to take."

In order to secure order there has to be a formal and objective scheme of authority. The authority that comes from the bottom is the authority that accepts the objective scheme, the hierarchy, the necessity for the communications, which is really the function of formal authority from people in the best position to make effective communications.

But when, even so, there is a departure from what people are willing to do what seems right to do, then the formal authority, again and again, breaks down in one way or another. People don't do what they don't want to do. They do not accept orders that they don't want to accept.

It will occur to you that that can't be true, because a soldier who violates a disciplinary rule is forcibly detained in

the guardhouse. When you say authority is made strict, I know of no proof that authority is broken down more than that that results in a physical restriction of the person who is detained. Right off the bat you have the positive proof that the authority was not accepted. It was violated and what you are doing is taking additional action involving somebody else's willingness to accept your authority, in using physical coercion on that man, the guard, the fellow who makes the arrest. But that is another stage, and that is another kind of authority that is being exercised.

Now let me swing into the question of responsibility, which is so closely related. I suppose you have heard the bromide in one form or another a thousand times, that there cannot be any authority without responsibility and that "responsibility has to be commensurate with authority." No statement that I know of is less true than that. It is false. Yet almost everyone believes it. You hear it in the Army, you hear it in business you hear it everywhere. "Responsibility and authority are commensurate."

I don't know exactly what the word "commensurate" means, whether you have no method of measuring, but that is the word that is used.

There is no organization that could possibly operate on such a system. Responsibility always must be greater than authority, or an organization would break down. If I can't get done in my job the things that I have no authority to ask to be done, the job wouldn't be done. It isn't sufficient. It isn't sufficient in an Army. It isn't sufficient in an educational institution. It isn't sufficient in any job that you think of. The kind of men that you are looking for are the kind of men who will accept responsibility that is far beyond any authority that you could give them.

Let me give you a simple illustration. A salesman's job is to sell goods. He has absolutely no authority of any kind or form over the possible buyer of the goods. But he is held responsible for selling just the same, and if he can't get people to buy, he ceases to be a salesman pretty promptly. He absolutely works day after day and hour after hour getting things done, without any authority whatever, except perhaps the authority to operate or work within a certain territory or with a certain group of prospective purchasers. That is a simple case in which things are done exclusively on the basis of demonstration and persuasion.

Any organization that has a good morale has people who

feel for and have an interest in accomplishments that are not in the book, and may not be within the scope of their formal authority or formal functions.

If you get a man who will only do the things that he is told to do, you may call him unimaginative, you may call him disloyal. You may call him by a great variety of terms, depending upon the manifestations that go with his limited behavior, but the fact is you have got a man whose responsibility -- his sense of responsibility, his acceptance of responsibility -- is too limited to function in the world where things cannot be done by specifying in advance what ought to be done; in other words, by ordering them to be done.

That is absolutely indispensable. Not only so, but in many situations anybody with a grain of sense would much rather work on the basis of responsibility, without authority, than he would to have authority and the responsibility limited to the formal extent of the authority.

I would give you a complex illustration of this one. Early in the war I took charge of the USO -- a very complicated and curious organization, which had at any given time in its full bloom not less than 600,000 people in its employ, nearly all of them volunteers. Just try to use a little authority on volunteers, if you want some fun! And it had to be made to work, and it had to be coordinated. It had to have moneys accounted for, and so forth.

A group of agencies -- the YMCA, YWCA, Salvation Army, National Catholic Community Service, Travelers' Aid, and the Jewish Welfare Board -- organized the USO, a collaborative effort, and made a deal with the U. S. government. They didn't make the kind of a deal they thought they were making. The government agreed to build a lot of buildings to hold these clubs, which were among the activities to be carried on. The government fell down on that job. They only built 300 out of the 3,000 that we ultimately had, and they delayed very much in doing it because they had other things to do. But they made it as one of the conditions under which they would agree to put up these buildings that the United Service Organization, although permitted to operate through these agencies, who were somewhat in the position of sub-contractors, would be responsible for throwing anyone of them out in any particular operation that was not being done well.

The organization became farflung, all over this country. Clubs were set up and they were assigned -- this case to the YMCA,

this to the Salvation Army, this to the Travelers' Aid, and so forth.

The only formal control that could be had at the top by the executive committee of the USO or its president was through the top of the agencies. Well, you can imagine what that meant, when you were operating from Maine to San Diego, with thousands of people in your employ, serving millions of men, that you couldn't get anything done in San Diego except by going through this long line.

That wasn't a very happy situation for the military, and there was no way to coordinate in a local area, say, like California, the activities of these various groups. Sometimes there would be six or seven of these clubs in one community. There was no way to coordinate the efforts of these agencies. So, much to the dismay of some of the important people involved, I appointed six division superintendents of the USO, whose job it was to coordinate the activities down in the local areas.

Well, the first thing that would happen would be that some division fellow would say, "I can't get anything done here because I haven't any authority. I can't order anybody to do anything."

I said, "Sure you can't, and I can't give it to you. I haven't got it either. But this job has to be done, and you have to take the responsibility for doing it, and if you take the responsibility and use some sense and work at it, you will get the coordination done without any authority."

That is precisely and exactly what happened. They could work more effectively without having any authority, any formal authority, over these few people, in most instances, than they could have if they had had the authority. They had to do by initiative and imagination and persuasion what they would not have had the imagination or the initiative to do if they had been in the position of formal authority.

So there are many instances, in my experience and observation, in which it is a positive disadvantage for a person to be afflicted with the possession of high formal authority.

I finally come to the question of persuasion. I have used the word in the last few minutes in connection with "How do you get things coordinated without authority?"

There are many forms of persuasion, if we make a very broad definition, as a mathematician might, and then say there are various degrees of this quantity we are talking about.

One form of persuasion is to set up conditions of fear. I suppose that it is a net loss, in other words, that it is a failure, it is another case where authority does not work from the top, but perhaps the best example of persuasion by fear is found in Russia today -- concentration camps, deaths, and all sorts of things. I won't live long enough so we will ever get it, but I should like to know what the overhead cost of operating that kind of a system is. We might have been able to find it out from Nazi Germany.

When you think of the ramifications and the proportion of the population that is involved in operating a country, or business, or anything else, on fear, I think you can easily come to the conclusion that it is self-defeating, that the standard of living in a totalitarian country never can rise because the overhead of operating the persuasion of fear is bound to be so great it is a failure. It is not an instance in which my fundamental principle about the nature of authority is negated. It is confirmed.

That is one thing. Much more important is persuasion by conditioning and education. Every business that I know of that amounts to anything spends enormous sums of money in conditioning people so they behave properly on their own. That is what you mean by training. That is what you really mean by education. That is the form of persuasion in which all of you folks are daily engaged in, and without it you just can't get behavior on its own, at the bottom where it has to be.

Defective as our training and education are we all hope, and we are all trying to improve it. What we have got is an indispensable means of conditioning people so they can act on their own responsibility and own authority.

Now, you don't see it quite so easily as I do. I am concerned with operations in public health and in agriculture and other things, in the primitive and undeveloped countries of the world where very few people are educated. This is in relation to point four. What in the world do you think you are going to do in those countries, unless you can condition the people so they can act on their own? They can't take orders. You can't take a Chilean, for instance, and put him in the power house and tell him what to do, and think you are going to get it done. What you

are going to do is blow up the generators, because he just isn't conditioned to do the thing. The only way it effectively can be done is on his own, on his own responsibility, on his own authority.

The last part of education and training consists in exposition. That is another form of persuasion. The intellectual appeal. It isn't awfully effective, but there are a considerable number of people to whom intellectual development of a subject, its rights and its wrongs, its effectiveness and its ineffectiveness, as conveyed by the intellectual process of exposition, is the only form of persuasion. I don't think it is quite so strong in lawyers as it is in engineers and architects, but it is used, and I think the hope of training and conditioning people in a highly civilized country, with an extremely complex social and technological situation, is that the persuasion by exposition will be a much more important part of the persuasive process in the future than it has been in the past.

Exhortation, the emotional appeal, is the much more important aspect of persuasion. If you will look at the political world where that is the method that really is used, much more than any other, frequently under the guise of exposition, where the meanings attached to words become so important, you will see that the cohesion that we have, the maintenance of the formal authorities that we recognize, depend enormously upon the use of exhortation as a means of persuading people to accept authority.

Finally, I would put in the class of persuasion -- perhaps by stretching the word too much -- what is implicit in a good deal of what I have already said, and that is the art of creating the conditions of autonomous organization.

The great battle between the totalitarians and the democratic liberals is really this: to what extent can you, by formal direction, attain results as against creating and developing and permitting autonomous organizations which operate on their own responsibility?

Adam Smith's unseen hand relates to autonomous organization. There is a physical chemist, who has now switched to economics at the University of Manchester, who has done more writing about that than anyone I have seen, and very few people, including those who are actually doing it, recognize the extent to which organizations and societies are run, sometimes, by a deliberate attempt, more often by trial and error, to create conditions under which people can manage themselves. Sometimes you

do it by creating competition.

Here is an interesting little bit of evidence. Last year I went up to see Mackenzie King. Mackenzie King was one of the early employees of the Rockefeller Foundation in connection with labor difficulties, particularly the Colorado Fuel and Iron situation. That stirred up so much resentment, so much fear, that the Foundation had to abandon that project, and Mackenzie King continued on his own and finally got out a book on the subject. I suppose he is one of the most experienced and wisest men of our times, who has the most marvelous diary that has ever been preserved by a public man -- just book after book, type-written, going back to 1912, of a man who has been premier of a British dominion, of a British government, longer than any man in modern times who was the sub rosa agent for Theodore Roosevelt and tried to deal in that Japanese conclusion business.

We knew he had no means to turn the great files he has of all sorts of material into useful memoirs. While I was up there visiting my object was to induce him to accept \$100,000 and get some staff in there so, before he died, he could turn some of this stuff out for the good of peoples everywhere.

While we were there he took us over to the parliament house, showed us where he used to sit when he was premier, where he now sits, and then he said, "I don't come here very often because I can't take it." Then he showed us the caucus room. This is what I am getting to. Every week the members of parliament in his party had a caucus and they all sat on the floor and asked questions of the ministers. Well one purpose of the caucus was not "to wash your dirty linen, your party linen, out on the floor. Let's do it back here behind closed doors." But the other purpose in Mackenzie King's mind was so the members could ask the ministers anything, and they would ask some of the things that he would like to have asked them, but didn't want to nag them. In other words, he was using this autonomous organization principle for getting things done without making himself too obnoxious to the people who were reporting to him.

Every executive knows that problem, that you have to get things done without constant nagging of the people reporting to you. You destroy morale when you do it. Get it done by getting somebody else automatically to do it.

I have seen a department created as an offset to the head of another department, who was going too far in one direction, following a line -- get another department set up that will

counteract, force him into line, automatically. No authority, just automatically.

It is a supreme art -- persuasion. However you do it, by whatever device, it is capable of an enormous amount of invention that no one has come across yet at all. I think we often forget that our ability, in this country particularly, and in a different way in Germany and in England, or in Russia, to keep cohesive societies of large size and complexity depends upon the invention of social arrangements. The limited liability corporation is one of the greatest inventions and had more to do with this industrial era, I think, than any of the technological developments. Most people don't even think of it. The lawyers do occasionally. But that was a great invention which has permitted mass production and mass distribution such as never could have been accomplished except by self state socialism. It is a great art. But there are an enormous number of people being turned out of our higher institutions of education who are not being taught -- it is better today than it was fifteen years ago--adequately that the art of persuasion is fundamental to the maintenance of authority, if you like to think in terms of formal authority coming from the top to the exercise of responsibility or authority from the bottom.

Every year I used to talk to the engineers in the Telephone Company about the importance of this thing. They scorned it. They think a salesman is the lowest form of life. They are intellectuals. They are more interested in the things that can be done with a mathematical formula, and that is very important. But they are unable to discharge their responsibilities if they cannot use persuasion in connection with the solid stuff that they are developing.

If I have an engineer who has a good idea, but he cannot sufficiently expose that idea to my more limited intelligence in that particular field, he does me no good. He is a complete loss to himself and to me, and to his business. Yet it is almost impossible to get the great majority of people trained that way, to recognize that that is a part of the job of every human being, to sell himself, to sell his goods, if he has any, to other people so that on their own responsibility and without authority they do the things that are desired to be done.

Thank you very much. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Mr. Barnard, we certainly thank you very much for having come and given us this time.

Unfortunately Mr. Barnard is going back to New York this afternoon, so he is not going to be around here for very long, when you might be able to get out of him a little bit more information of what you do when students don't want you to tell them what to do, and what powers of persuasion you can bring to them. But there is a good deal, certainly, in what Mr. Barnard has said that you will have no difficulty in making direct application. I am sure that without knowing it, most of us spend a good deal of our time trying to develop a zone of indifference which makes students do what they are supposed to do most of the time, without question.

We have fifteen or twenty minutes now in which you may ask Mr. Barnard questions --at least I presume that he will be willing to attempt to answer your questions -- and in which we can have a brief discussion of Mr. Barnard's address.

Who has a question for Mr. Barnard? Don't be bashful. I am sure he wasn't that lucid so that you all feel perfectly satisfied.

MR. A. BLAIR KNAPP (Temple University): Would you develop this idea of the zone of indifference just a little bit more? I think the whole thing was very clear, but that puzzles me just a little bit.

MR. BARNARD: The easiest illustration -- although when you take the trouble to dig up cases, there are innumerable ones-- is the case of a soldier. To make it simple, let's take the volunteer. He volunteers and accepts the regime. He does it on his own. He creates the authority by which he is governed by that act. Well, he is indifferent whether you send him to San Diego, to Portland, Maine, or somewhere else. He may have some preferences but he already has it in his mind that that sort of thing is the thing he is indifferent about. He accepted a wide zone of indifference to the conditions under which he would live and operate.

Skillful people are very careful about operating within that zone of indifference. If there are two ways to get things done, one of which is unpleasant to the person who is asked to do it, and the other is a matter of indifference to him, take the one that is in the zone of indifference. If you don't, your authority is going to be denied pretty quick, and you can see instances of that going on all the time -- fool orders that never ought to be issued, that are not made good because they don't take into account the preferences, the limitations, the instincts and interests of the people to whom they are addressed. The industrial world is full of failure to recognize that.

MR. WILLIS M. TATE (Southern Methodist University): You spoke about communications from the top down. Would you talk to us a little bit about recognizing and clearing communications from the bottom up?

MR. BARNARD: Communication, of course, if it is to be effective at all, is a two-way matter. In any organization communications are coming from the bottom and going to the top, as well as going from the top to the bottom. The only information that the top has to operate on, in almost all cases, is information that came from the bottom.

I think probably what is in your mind is that the people at the top are very frequently deaf. They can't hear some of the things that come from the bottom. They don't cultivate expression of those things because they don't understand it. The same thing also operates in the reverse direction. It is a very, very common difficulty of people who, even though they came from the bottom, when they get up in the clouds, put out stuff that is not comprehensible. Some of it is "goggle-de-gook," and some of it is shot to the type of experience and type of mind which is not relevant. That is a common difficulty in communication in organization. Then you must also add that the facilities for communication -- our understanding of its limitations, and to the problems -- are very much undeveloped at the present time. I gave you an instance in the submarine with respect to commands. But there are many facets of that subject.

I suppose that it is fair to say that most communications, up or down, either way, are misunderstood unless they are repeated many times and discussed, and gone at from a number of angles. That is the conference method. That is the training method that is required to introduce new conditions in almost any organization.

I might say that I believe we are at this moment on the verge of the most important developments and discoveries in the whole field of communication. It is statistical probability nature which is the theory worked out by the Bell Laboratories, and our friend Norbert Wiener, in his Sorbonne Ethics, linguistics is going to be completely revolutionized. The fact that the nervous system does not operate on wholes, but only operates on excess -- the fact that we hear by excess and never by whole words -- makes it impossible for a person in the rear of this room to hear an "h" in some cases when I use it, but they know I am using it.

Similarly with the use of words. We guess at what people are saying. If I say "in spite", you can be 99 per cent sure -- and that is the way you work it -- that the next word is "of," and you hear "of" whether your ear gets it or doesn't.

That is just a diversion, but its relevance is that our understanding and our ability to communicate, up or down, from many standpoints is extremely defective.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I just want to say there, I think that the immediate application, and one of the places that I have certainly had to apply, or try to apply, this thing -- if you read through the regulations of your college with the idea of whether they really communicate what you want the student to know about them, there are very few of them that can't be misinterpreted, and you are working with a group that are trying their best to misinterpret them. And that is a communication problem.

MR. BARNARD: Let me confirm that by this article written by somebody, I think, in Boston, in the current number of the "Atlantic Monthly," in which he takes teachers' colleges apart and he quotes from some of the catalogs, and "gracious goodness!" you say, "if people can't use language better than that!"

MR. BARRY HOLLISTER (Antioch College): I wanted to ask whether our traditional form of organization -- board of trustees, administrative officers, faculty and students -- as separate as we have tended to be, may not be a serious handicap for the kind of communication and responsibility you speak of?

MR. BARNARD: You have hit me on a spot that I am apt to effervesce about. I think the organization of these educational institutions is atrocious. [Laughter and applause] We have given the committee of the Association of Universities, or University Presidents, whichever they call it, \$400,000 to see how you deal with the physical problems of these institutions. One of the things that you ought to deal with is the question of organization. The root of the troubles are two or three. One is the dedicated funds that are set up professional-wise, for God knows, forever, for some doggoned thing that that university ought not be doing at all, and they can't get away from it.

Number two is a false treatment of the problem of academic freedom. Now, I am for academic freedom in the sense that if there is one place left in this country where people ought to be able to say what they think, wise or foolish, it should be the educational institution. But the professor group carries that over into the business of monkeying with the administration, and they create breeds of thorns for themselves by doing it. They

prevent an administration from doing the things that they ought to be able to do for the faculty, and don't even know it.

That is number two, and I have forgotten what number three is, but I think there are more than three. [Laughter]

MR. LEON D. STRATTON (Drexel Institute of Technology): I would like you to talk a little bit about discipline. When you think discipline has a function, after you have tried all these powers of persuasion that you always do try, does there not come a time when something must be done about it?

MR. BARNARD: Surely. The people at the bottom insist on it. If you fail to maintain discipline, you have lost your whole crowd. You let a Captain in the Army fail to enforce discipline, when every man in the company knows their life and death depend upon managing the thing, and see how quick he is out. Discipline comes from the bottom. It is insisted upon. The reason a locomotive engineer stands for stiff discipline is because he sees the logic of it. It is a matter of life and death, not only to their passengers but to themselves.

Certainly, discipline, but it has to be within the limits of what the people at the bottom think are right. In the Army they didn't think the court martial business was right, and it didn't work very well because they didn't think it was right. There is a lot of revision that was due and now has been made. It has to be adapted to the sense of the people in the organization. But don't think anything I have said means that you can get along without discipline. You certainly have to have discipline, but you haven't got a good organization unless most of the discipline is self-discipline.

I was talking to the president of one of these organizations that has both men and women in it. When the war was over a lot of GIs came back, and they were pretty mature fellows. They had been out a long while, in wild conditions. The sexual situation was pretty terrible. The ministers in the town came down to ride the university until the president said, "Wait a minute. We haven't had these fellows here more than two or three months. You have had them for 23, 24 and 25 years. So I guess the trouble isn't here."

"Well," I said, "what happened? What happened with this outrageously promiscuous situation, almost public situation, in your place?"

He said, "The students themselves took hold of it. They disciplined it. They got it in order and it is the only way you

could get it in order." Neither a police authority, or university authority, nor any other authority can get that kind of thing in order except the people themselves, when they see the heinous silliness of that kind of behavior.

But discipline you are bound to have. It is only a question of whether you make it too formal and have to have too much of it, or whether it is self-imposed.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Do we have some other questions of Mr. Barnard? We still have a few minutes here before we have to let him get away.

MR. ARCH B. CONKLIN (Bowling Green): We all, as you have talked, tried to apply what you have said to our own local situations, I know. I would like to ask you what you do when about 3,000 men come back from service, as you have said, and demand liquor on the campus in every spot, in a spot where it wasn't approved and wasn't wanted? I think that is all I need to say, other than to ask you whether the instructions, or orders, would have to come from the top or would you wait for the students to decide that liquor has no place on that campus.

MR. BARNARD: Well now, you are asking for a general answer to a specific situation, and I don't know of anything more risky than that. If I had that situation, the first thing I would do would be to study it. I certainly wouldn't operate on any abstract principles. But with that qualification and limitation, I think probably I would try to stir up the students to do it, if I could. I certainly wouldn't make an order that there is no liquor here, unless I was fairly sure I was going to make it stick.

Those two things I am quite sure would be in my approach to that problem. Get the students. I can't believe it is possible in any of your institutions that if you go at it the right way, and you are talking about something that really is right, and not just a whim, not just a stuffed shirt exhibition of prestige and authority, that you couldn't get the best element in your student body to take the lead on that kind of thing. Maybe I am wrong. Maybe you could in some cases, and you could not in others. But certainly you don't want to issue orders that you know you are not going to make stick. You have lost everything when you get that kind of a situation, I think.

MR. ARNO J. HAACK (Washington University): You showed so much insight into the college faculty a moment ago with your second point, I wonder if you would venture a comment on student government and its rule in this whole area?

MR. BARNARD: I don't know much about student government. That is somewhat like labor unions. I know more about them. [Laughter]

In general I dislike formal auxiliary organizations. That is, I think a student body ought to be pretty much self-governing. But the minute you set up a political organization, which is what you do when you formalize these things, then you have to deal with artificial issues -- how to worry the faculty, or how to throw the president out of his stride, or how to keep the deans up nights with large headaches, and artificial problems of what goes with the creation of formal organization. Officers have to have something to do in order to get elected. They have to say, "Look at the guys who are going to do it, or have done the things that you like," and "we already count for something in the world," and that sort of artificial political stimulation.

That is all I could say about it. I suppose you are always going to have some of them, and some of them will be innocuous. Some of them must be a terrific headache. [Laughter]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I would just like to interpolate there that I, having been one of the people who read and absorbed the book from which a good many of these remarks are only a partial context, that one of the things that Mr. Barnard started with, and on which he is founded, is that there are certain things in an organization that are necessary in order to make this work, and when you get an organization which is as bad as colleges are, where you have a whole section -- the student body -- which is really opposed in a certain extent by your faculty and alumni interests, where your interests are different, you have an ineffective organization and an ineffectual organization, and therefore the problems of applying these things to it become that much more difficult. The real answer to the problem would be to change the organization, to change the form of organization, and that is a problem in which we are definitely dealing. We are all more or less responsible for setting up agencies of student government, and setting them up so that they are useful, and I think that is what the problem is that most of us have to find that they are very useful supplementary organizations.

MR. BARNARD: I would like to make a final remark, if I may, about faculties. I believe in academic freedom. I believe in that very deeply. I believe this security business we are getting into is one of the most dangerous things we have got. It is almost a mania on the part of some people. But it is a fact, in my opinion, that a greater sense of responsibility to the

institution ought to be developed on the part of many faculty members.

Let me give you a concrete illustration of that. I was trustee of Rutgers University and of the University of Newark a number of years ago. The University of Newark was a consolidation of several smaller local institutions, two law schools and a liberal arts affair, and I think a technical college. They wanted the right to issue degrees. The control of that right was vested in the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education was not, probably, too well satisfied with the status of the institution and they had good grounds for that, but it was rather important locally and it was backed by some very important people. They asked me if I could help them pry this thing loose and get the State Board of Education to give the right to grant degrees.

One of my friends, a man named Morehouse, who was a telephone man of the AT&T company, was then on the State Board, and I dealt with him. My method of dealing with him was this: This institution is going to be all right. The situation is such that if you do not get this degree, the only possible recourse will be to the legislature, which is the final control in this business and I don't think your board would want to have the legislature begin to monkey with the question of giving degrees.

All right. The legislature in that particular year was controlled by a gentleman named Frank Hague in Jersey City. Mr. Hague was having a good deal of difficulty with some people over the question of civil liberties. He was supposed to be restricting the civil liberties of some group and the matter was in the courts. A professor of the University of Newark picked out that particular time to go over to Jersey City and fight the cause of civil liberties, [laughter] in which he couldn't do a darn thing. It straightened itself out through the courts. That is where it was. But it could have ruined the chances of his university getting the very thing he wanted them to have. His status as a professor certainly was very much smaller in an institution that couldn't give degrees.

I think that is an instance -- perhaps you think that is too strained -- of irresponsibility.

I know, of course, many faculty people. I have been associated with that group all my life. I know that many of them have a deep sense of responsibility to the institution of which they are a part. That is perfectly true. But there have been no inculcations that I know of, in any direct way, of the fact that

in addition to being responsible to society and his profession and his calling, and his field -- really professors ought to have a little more sense of responsibility than I think they show to the institution as a whole that makes it possible for them to live the kind of life they want to. It might aid them in getting the funds, which after all all these faculties finally depend on.

That is all, and thank you very much. It has been a pleasure to be here with you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We will recess for a few minutes so you can stand up and stretch, and don't go out.

... Recess ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Let's come to order again, gentlemen, please.

Just showing the efficiency of this organization, we are now some twenty-five minutes ahead of schedule -- probably the first time it will ever happen.

We will proceed with the briefing of the workshop session. Then that will give you a few minutes recess and time to get to your various locations.

Before we go on, Fred Turner has some announcements.

SECRETARY FRED H. TURNER (University of Illinois): Thank you. This is some announcements and some questions we want to raise.

First of all, on the registration desk you will find copies of the Secretary-Treasurer's reports. Please check those. If there are any questions you want to raise, don't hesitate to raise them.

Also you will find some publications there that came from Ohio State University. Joe Park was kind enough to send them along. And John has a lot of stuff in the way of material, information, maps, suggestions and so on. I expect John will say something about that himself when he gets here.

... Announcements re luncheon and subjects to be discussed at the various tables ...

SECRETARY TURNER: Sitting right back here in the middle aisle is Don Kerr, from Cornell University, who is here

for a good time, but he is representing the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers. I think we ought to make Don work a little bit, and sign him up to work a little bit on that subject. So, Don, will you sign number 1 on a sheet up there and label it "Foreign Student Advisement," and people who are interested in that check on that. [Applause]

We have already mentioned Don. All the old members know Joe Isen. [Applause as he arose] Joe has been the reporter for this group since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. If you have ever been at this meeting more than once, he will know you by your name, but just the same it helps if you tell your name when you stand up, as you did before, then he can get it in the minutes.

... Announcement re tipping ...

SECRETARY TURNER: This is a matter both for the executive committee and the whole group. There is a question of the committee on nominations and place. That is automatically and by law made up of the past presidents of the organization, and they will elect their own chairman, and they will begin their sessions in the near future. So any suggestions about next year's meeting, or the time of it, and any suggestions you have about nominations should go to them. By law, Scott Goodnight will become the chairman of that, unless he insists that he does not want to. He is the Senior Dean in order of service here, from the standpoint of being the oldest past president, but he may refuse to serve in that capacity. If he does, someone else will be the chairman. We don't know yet until that committee meets whether he is going to be the chairman.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: He is going to be the chairman. I order that.

SECRETARY TURNER: So, Scott, stand up and let them see who you are. [Applause as he arose] They will see too much of you anyway before the meeting is over.

That finishes all that I have. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: After Don has finished giving his briefing address, John Hocutt will make some announcements about how you get to these various meeting rooms and where they are. We are provided with guides and bus transportation for those of you who are going a couple of blocks down the line here to your meeting rooms.

Now we are going to get under way for the topic of the

afternoon sessions, which is to be "Student Government," and we are going to be briefed on that subject by Dean Donald M. DuShane, of the University of Oregon, who has been attending these meetings for a long time, sat through a good many discussions on this subject, and I am glad to have Don start us off on that. Donald DuShane. [Applause]

MR. DONALD M. DU SHANE (University of Oregon): It is a nice spot for me to be in here, with this meeting running twenty minutes ahead of time. I think I can improve that a little bit by slicing my remarks. After all, there is not much that I want to tell you about student government.

When I was a student at Columbia, I had a course with Professor John Herman Randall on the history of philosophy, and among the few things that I remember well from that was a differentiation he made between the philosophy of Plato and the philosophy of Aristotle. He said Plato is for young men. He draws a vision of the wonderful world that could be, in which justice prevails, in which men are dedicated to the good; but that Aristotle is an old man's philosopher, the cynical voice of the morning after, when the heady wine of the night before has left only the head on the shoulders of the old man. He said, "Aristotle says, 'This is the way it is. This is how things are, not the way they might be, in the cold clear light of the morning, not the soft deceptive lights or the idyllic mood of the night before.'"

So I have been asked, greying as I am, after eleven years of these meetings, to tell you "This is how it is with student government." Well, I don't know of any better way to start an argument than for one of us, and one of the less in terms of wisdom, for one like me, to say, "This is how it is." But I will be blunt. I will be positive, I will try not to be diplomatic. I will remember, I am not speaking to my colleagues on the faculty who have acquired a faculty for the arts of persuasion, but to friends, and I will keep in mind, for the next few minutes, something I learned from my great-grandfather Anderson, who always did as he damn pleased. He said, "If the people don't know me, why should I care what they think of me? If they do know me, why it won't make any difference anyway."

Student government is a fertile field, educationally, and all too often a fallow field. I would like to start with the premise that those of us who work with students can probably get more substantial reward for our time and our effort through the field of student government than we can by any other single line of endeavor.

At the NEA meetings at Chicago last spring, Vic Spat-helf, whom most of you know, chairmaned a group on student activities, which group, after three days' discussion, developed a list of things, a list of reasons why student activities were educationally valid. He said they made for social adjustment, for the development of leadership, for practice in cooperative techniques, for the expression of student needs and interests, they served as a laboratory for applying academic learning, and they contributed to vocational effectiveness.

Then in his summation he went ahead to point out that the development of responsibility through practice was an essential if students are to realize what can be obtained, what they can obtain in their total educational experience.

I agree in principle with all of that. I think that students can gain more in what Mr. Barnard called the art of persuasion, the other non-objective factors which we hope will come to them in the course of their education, through extra-curricular activities, than they can actually in classroom activities. But if this is to be true, if they are to realize that the maintenance and expansion of opportunities in student government depend on the maturity of their performance, then the maturity of their performance must be recognized by us in permitting the expansion of opportunities for exercising and assuming responsibility.

In the years before I was a dean, when I was teaching government instead of administering it, I talked to Father Schwitalla of St. Louis University, who was at the time checking Lawrence College for the Central Association, and he asked me what my objectives were as a teacher of political science. I wasn't sure that I had stopped to think myself what they were, but I gave him a quick answer. It pleased me, and I think it pleased him. I said, "First, we want to teach the students what government really is, or what it is as we think it is, in terms of constitution and laws, what we tell the immigrant as he applies for citizenship. In the second place we need to discuss it and understand it as it actually is, extra-governmentally, through pressure groups, political machines, the ways in which we get together outside the laws to effect the objectives of society. In the third place, we need to understand it too as it could be."

Here I am back to a combination of Aristotle and Plato, in terms of the idealism that young people have, and that we as teachers must have in part if we are to be successful when we work with them. It is only when we base the idealism in the third point on the disillusionment of the second, the way things really

are and the way things actually operate, that our students learn how to be effective in terms of their objectives as they learn how they can accomplish them over obstacles.

This year, teaching a course in comparative government, I asked my students what provision the new constitution of France made for the dissolution of parliament, and one student, I think smarter than he realized, wrote on his paper that the constitution made no provision for the "dissolutionment" of the French parliament. [Laughter]

Of course, that is correct in France. It wasn't necessary to provide for the "dissolutionment" of the French parliament, nor should it be I felt for students in our colleges and universities. It should not be necessary to provide for their disillusionment, because their disillusion and then their subsequent infusing with idealism ought to be part of what they get from their teaching, if their teaching is to be applied effectively by them.

Anyway, Father Schwitalla told me that my approach effected a trichotomy in terms of my subject, which impressed me even more than I had impressed him. [Laughter]

So I will begin with that. First, as we think it is, without thinking; secondly, as it really is; and third, as it is capable of being. Then we add to that, in terms of implementation, that students learn best by doing. I know that is true in political science. I think it is true in many other fields. Secondly, that students learn about people. They learn the arts of diplomacy. They learn what motivates men and women. They learn the arts of persuasion. Mr. Barnard spoke of that. By experience. Very effectively, by doing, by trying, by failing, by trying again, and succeeding.

My advice in terms of student government would be, let them do, let them experience. Help them to draw conclusions, yes. Help them to think things through, but remember that you are helping them to do these things for themselves. If you take that assumption, all questions fall into the pattern and answer themselves.

The question: How do you get good students into activities? The answer is: make the activities significant. Make them worth a good student's time, not a time-consuming, profitless sort of thing. To the question: How can you get students to assume responsibility? The answer would then be: Give the responsibility to them, as fast and as much as they can shoulder.

To the question: How can you be sure they will use good judgment? The answer is: Give them the facts. Give them the realities and their implications, and then watch the students judge.

Get them to help us apply the art of persuasion. Now, a teacher doesn't say to a student in a course, "Here's a problem, solve it." A teacher says, "Here are some principles. Here are some pertinent facts. Now how do you go about applying them?" Or, "How do we go about applying them?"

There are some requisite conditions to this sort of approach. It is necessary not to go too far or too fast. You must operate from the traditions, and you must develop in due time, if you want new or changing traditions, if the old ones are not what you think you can easily reconcile with the educational objective that you are devoted to.

Great Britain has a parliament which has no restrictions on its power whatsoever. Yet I do not doubt that even in these days of crucial questioning of the nationalization of an industry like steel that the British parliament is probably more generally trusted and respected by the people who live under it, than is true of the Congress of the United States which is hedged around with legal checks and balances. Certainly that is true if you apply it to some Congressmen and Senators.

You must not, to put it differently, go too fast at first. You must work out of the background. You must work in terms of what is possible; and that means you cannot get all the way there in one fell swoop.

In the second place, it is necessary in student government to have a breadth of representation. All interested groups ought to be represented, not just the one which happened to win a majority of the votes in an election which was voted in by a minority of the total student body. The chief advantage, the biggest help here, I am certain -- and we have used it effectively at all three of the institutions I have been connected with, at Columbia College, Lawrence College and the University of Oregon -- is proportional representation. The principle that when a substantial minority exists, that substantial minority must be represented and cannot be permitted to be snowed under with no representation, as a result, by another temporary majority.

If you want people to vote, you have got to make that vote meaningful. You must not let it become worthless. If they know that if they vote they can elect no one -- as is all too frequently the case in American politics and in educational institutions, in student elections -- then you are making that

election meaningless and you are missing the opportunity to get breadth of representation.

There is another thing that could help in this, and that is to create competition. If you have a situation in which, if there are two parties, both parties can get some seats, you increase the quality of leadership and you increase the caliber of your campaign almost automatically.

Another point is that you must seek continuity and consistency in student government. Just as in our own government the Supreme Court insists, in most years at least, on applying certain rules about what we can and cannot do, and the framework in which we must operate, so we must provide in student government for things like overlapping terms so that you do not, so that you do not break in a brand new bunch of students every semester and faculty representation on some policy making boards, so that there will be another angle represented as the students come and go.

To come back to an earlier illustration, you don't give a class a text, say "Here's a text, here's a subject," and then have the teacher walk out of the door. Nor do you take a tenderfoot into the wilderness and say, "Here are some mountain trails, now go and explore them without a guide." But we mustn't forget, a teacher's role is progressively different. We have to have a teacher in the classroom. We have to have a guide in the wilderness. But the role of the teacher and the role of the guide is one which is progressively different, from freshman year to senior year, to graduating years, and we must not forget that the role of the teacher and of the guide is to help the student, to develop the student, to strengthen the student so that he can try things for himself.

To be more specific, I would like to give you, as a basis for discussion in the subsequent round tables -- and you can think of scores of things, where I am contributing only this one-- a sample list of ways to handle certain areas traditionally associated with student government. There are certainly areas in which students can be entrusted with full responsibility, with only very nominal faculty or administrative supervision. I am not making a prescription here, I am simply listing a sample as a basis for starting:

Student elections. Nominations of students. Members on boards and committees. The control, the reduction in numbers, the basis for authorizing campus charity drives. Maybe the institution has a faculty rating system, which could be done by

students when it could not be done by any other group. Setting up certain student organizations to handle specific problems, such as traffic problems, giving the students a chance to prove their maturity and their dependability in a restricted area like that, to help you, maybe, convince the faculty that the students can do such things.

Then there is an area after this one, a flexible area which would vary from institution to institution, an area in which there ought to be joint responsibility, possibly student finances. Maybe it should be in the first group. The determination of policy, if not the operation of the student Union, if there is one. The determination of certain issues, perennial issues, in student affairs, a recognition of organizations. The setting of standards for them. The formulation of rules for students, even hours for women, for example.

I would put in this group, for a starter at least, discipline, student discipline. I would include in it not only behavior outside the classroom, but as a possibility academic honesty, plagiarism, as an area in which students and faculty are jointly concerned and can best operate by joint measures.

The editing and publishing of the year book and newspaper. The operation of the non-business end of dormitories. The responsibility for what goes on, and stopping what goes on, or encouraging other things to go on in fraternities and sororities. Maybe that can well be left in the first area. Give the students full responsibility and then watch to see how they can be challenged to measure up to it.

Then there is a third group of subjects, which are farthest removed from the conventional, in which I believe the students ought at least be consulted or informed. We might do a lot more in the way of sharing with students information on which institutional policies are based, not only on such things simply as the determination of calendar or maybe discipline belongs here in some institutions, but even -- even, I say -- curricular developments.

This morning I was talking to Ed. Williamson for a moment and he mentioned that at the University of Minnesota they developed a Student Bill of Rights, under which a student would be protected from the arbitrary whim, the momentary fancy of a dean. Maybe the formulation of such a bill of rights would be a good place to start in discussing, strengthening and improving student government on your campuses.

The conclusion which all of these remarks of mine seem

to point to is that we ought to entrust to the students all matters in which they are willing to assume, and able properly to execute, responsibility; and that the role we have as deans and teachers ought to be to encourage their willingness, to help develop their ability, to help them to help us maybe to convince the faculty.

You ask about principles. Well I submit that this is an area not subject to abstract principles, but it is an art, not a science. Local situations from college to college, university to university, are infinitely varied and the approach has to be pragmatic about relativity, and in pragmatism I am inclined to be dogmatic.

I would like to sum this up by quoting Scottie Goodnight. I think it was at the Purdue meeting that he made what will be an unforgettable remark for me. He said, "Sometimes youth thinks that it is unfettered, when it is really unbuttoned." [Laughter]

I would say, all right, take that one. Maybe it is true. What do you do about it? Well I think you would tell youth, you let them get the idea, and then let youth button it-self up. You don't have to do the buttoning yourselves. Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We will not submit Mr. DuShane to questioning. You can do your questioning in the groups in which you will shortly now adjourn to meet.

John, do you want to come up here and tell these boys how they are going to get where they are going to get, and why? In case any of you have not met John Hobutt, Dean of Men at William and Mary, who has made most of the arrangements for this thing, he certainly deserves a hand for what he has done. [Applause]

MR. HOCUTT: I have one or two announcements before telling you about how you get to these meeting rooms.

... Announcements ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We will not attempt to move up the time of these workshop sessions, which are scheduled to start at four. You will therefore have an extra ten minutes or so before you go now.

Fred has another announcement to be made.

SECRETARY TURNER: Two announcements.

The first one is not at all surprising in a group of this size and a program of this size, that at the last minute there have to be some changes. Dean Gluck, who is with Workshop No. 1, Group 4, will not be here to serve as recorder for this group. He will not get here in time. Pete Pitre from MIT will serve in that capacity.

The other item that I want to bring up is one of certain sadness and the thing that I think we should refer immediately to the chairman of the Resolutions Committee, and that is Arno Haack who is standing right here. Ed Williamson tells me that our good friend Gilbert Wrenn suffered a serious lung embolism last Sunday and is seriously ill in Northwest Hospital in Minneapolis, and I believe it might be well for this group to prepare an immediate resolution and send it to him, by resolution from this session. If that is in order I would like to pass that to the Resolutions Committee.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I hear a motion which is seconded that the Secretary be instructed to do so. Is there any discussion? Is there any objection? If not, it is so ordered.

All right, gentlemen, will you please attend to Dean Hocutt's request that we meet promptly this evening, because we have a program there which is going to be interesting, and we want to satisfy our host.

The meeting is adjourned.

... The conference then divided into five workshop groups in order to discuss "Student Government" ...

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

March 16, 1950

The Convention reconvened at nine-fifteen o'clock, President Neidlinger presiding.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I am sure everybody is all prepared to go to work this morning, except for some like myself who have to blame Will Hayes for having lost most of our voice last night. I suppose that wasn't his fault as much as our own.

Fred has some announcements to make, before we get down to work.

SECRETARY TURNER: You might like some preliminary registration figures. We have 191 registered, and we know there are at least a dozen people here who haven't registered yet, so there is quite a crowd. These 191 registered come from 37 states, with Ohio leading the list with 21 so far. Pennsylvania is second with 18, and Illinois is third with 17. So that is doing pretty well.

... Announcements in re luncheon and committee meetings ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: The topic for this morning's workshop is going to be "Administration of Student Personnel Programs," and the briefing will be done now by Vice President A. Blair Knapp, Temple University. Hiding under that impressive title is nothing more than a very good and very experienced Dean. Blair Knapp. [Applause]

MR. KNAPP: Mr. President, Gentlemen: I am not an expert on this subject, except in perhaps one category. I am, temporarily, a man away from home, and I guess that is one of the main qualifications. I also have some suspicions that the effectiveness of speeches is declining in this mid-century.

A friend of mine, a woman lecturer, had been going for about an hour on a very learned lecture, after which one of these gushing females rushed up to the front of the room and said, "My dear, you were so, so right."

My friend smiled in a way we all smile when someone agrees with us, and she said, "Just what part of my remarks did you like best?"

"Oh," she said, "that isn't what I am talking about. You

are so right not to wear pearls with that dress." [Laughter]

The first thing that impresses me about our topic for this morning is its size. Personnel administration actually covers everything we do. There is no topic we can discuss, I think, no problem in personnel, that ultimately does not become in some respect a problem of administration. Therefore, as I conceive my function this morning, it is to be rather arbitrary and rather dogmatic in picking out certain problems in the field of administration, and suggesting that perhaps our workshops could be profitably devoted to those. If we don't be arbitrary about it, we may roam all over the map, and get very little on a good deal. Perhaps it would be wiser to get more on a few problems.

There are one or two things that, in my judgment, might well be eliminated from our discussions this morning, because I think they either have been discussed to the point where we have reasonable understanding, or further discussion would not be as profitable as it might be in other respects.

One of these points is the philosophy of administration, not that it is unimportant, but I think in all of the areas of personnel work, we probably have wider agreement on what we might call the philosophy of our program than anything else. That is expressed, I think, for most of us, in the phrase, the personnel point of view. Don Gardner spelled it out for us at Dallas. The revision of the personnel point of view published by the American Council on Education, with which our Ed Williamson had a good deal to do, is an excellent statement. I think I am not far wrong in saying that we are in pretty general agreement with those objectives and with that philosophy.

Since administration is nothing but management, administration -- the test of it, the philosophy of it -- is simply to seek to implement that personnel point of view. Therefore, I am suggesting that this philosophy of administration of personnel, perhaps we could consider we have taken along to a point where we might well eliminate it from our discussion this morning.

I have also been impressed with the fact that that personnel point of view grew, and some of our so-called Old Guard in this organization had probably as much to do with its growth as anybody else. It wasn't formulated by the professors. It grew out of experience. I think that is why we find ourselves in such substantial agreement with it.

Secondly, may I suggest that it might be well to avoid a discussion of structure, not that the issue is settled by any means,

and not that we are in substantial agreement on it. But at this point I don't believe there would be much value in discussing whether a dean of students setup is preferable to a dean of men and dean of women, and so on. I think that we have covered that ground pretty well and I feel personally that it is impossible to blueprint a so-called ideal structure of personnel administration, and to try to lay that blueprint down on this campus or that campus, or another campus. Each one of us has circumstances that are different. Each one of us has certain historical situations, certain personnel situations, which condition the kind of administrative setup we are going to have on our campuses, and I personally can't get excited about this particular controversy.

My test of an administrative structure, is, does it effectively implement the personnel point of view on your campus? If it does, I don't care what the titles are, and I don't care what the structural arrangements are, and I don't think it matters a great deal. Of course, there is definitely a trend toward the dean of students setup. We are all aware of that. There is a trend toward more coordination of student personnel services. But if, this morning, we get started on that kind of controversy, I am afraid we might not get away from it.

Therefore, let me arbitrarily suggest four problems which I think are very important, perhaps not the most important, but terribly important nonetheless, which we might look at this morning, and I am going to toss in a fifth, which is a kind of prejudice of mine, at the end, which maybe you would have some time to take a look at. You will note that some of these suggestions relate very closely with things that Mr. Barnard had to say to us yesterday, and of course that is no surprise, since he was talking to us about administration.

I think the Number One problem in personnel administration in 1950 is this problem which has constantly bobbed up since we have been here, the problem of communication, communication with students, communication with faculty, communication with fellow administrators, communication with alumni, communication with the community, the public, which we serve. When I suggest that we kick this around a bit in our workshops, I have in mind that each of us should learn from the others specific techniques. Let's not talk about generalities. We know we have a problem of communication. We know we are not doing it well. Let's see if we can't learn what we are doing to meet that problem, and I am sure that each of us can learn from the others.

As an example of the kind of thing I mean, yesterday in the student government workshops the inadequacy of relying upon a student council as the sole medium of communication was pointed out.

We are experimenting with a little device, alongside our so-called student senate. We have created a student assembly which has no authority, no power, is not part of the so-called student government structure at all. Its sole purpose is a communication device. One person from every single organization on the campus is a member of that assembly. It meets regularly. The members thereof are obligated to go back to their groups and report. The communication is two-way. The members bring from their group questions and problems on which they want the administration, the faculty, or the student senate to take some action, or to discuss. That is a technique. How valuable it is, I don't know. We are just experimenting with it.

You will have other techniques. How do we get the personnel point of view across to the faculty? Techniques in that respect are terribly important. Faculty persons don't understand, frequently, what the personnel office is all about. It is essential that they should. What are you doing to get the personnel point of view across to members of the faculty?

The second problem which I suggest, after communication, is the problem of coordination. Personnel services have grown like Topsy. I don't suppose there is a man in this room who has a monopoly on his campus of the personnel services. They are scattered all over the place, and of course, ideally, the lowliest janitor would be a personnel officer. Therefore a very major problem in personnel administration in 1950 is how to tie these personnel services together so that they are working in accordance with a common philosophy, along lines and toward objectives which all accept. Perhaps, as it has been expressed, you may get a certain centralization of administration with a decentralization of functions. How are you coordinating these things?

I think this is a pertinent problem here, regardless of title. I don't care whether you are a dean of men, with a dean of women on your campus, or whether you are a dean of students, or what you are. I don't care whether you have authority for coordination or not. Mr. Barnard's point yesterday is very pertinent right here. Whether you have authority or not, you do have responsibility, because you cannot possibly implement the personnel point of view on a campus without coordinating personnel services. So again, what specific techniques have you found useful to coordinate personnel services on your campus?

Again, just to give an example, we have used one that we have found very effective. We have an organization called the Personnel Council, of which the dean of student is permanent chairman. It is about forty in number and it is made up of a representative from every single office and agency which is doing

a major personnel job -- placement, student health, athletics, the academic deans, and so forth.

As dean of students, without authority in many areas, I found it very useful to appoint a sub-committee of the personnel council to deal with a problem on which I knew action had to be taken. If I had recommended it, I would have had my neck out a mile and somebody would have been there with an ax to cut it off. But if I appointed a sub-committee--and of course the chairman is ex-officio chairman of sub-committees--if you carefully select your sub-committee, you can get a favorable report towards your project, which is accepted by the personnel council, and it then becomes not your pet project but an endorsed program of the gentlemen and women who represent the entire personnel situation. I have found it possible to get several controversial projects accepted without a murmur of protest by that device.

What other techniques are there which can be useful in this connection?

The third problem: How are we going to get more manpower? Somebody asked me shortly after I arrived what kind of a year I had had, and I said, "Hectic." And I have discovered that that is pretty general. Everybody seems to have had a kind of a hectic year. Not that any single situation has caused it, but the pressure has been constant.

My friends, I am suggesting that we haven't seen anything yet. The pressure is going to be increasingly serious, which means one thing to me. We have got to have more help. We have got to have more help at a time when budgets are shrinking. Where are we going to get manpower to do this job, when we can't go out and hire the number of people we should have?

To break this down a little bit, can we discuss techniques by which we can induce members of the faculty to become part of this personnel team, in a way they haven't become before? What techniques are we using to use student counsellors?

We have had just one experience, last fall, with an experimental freshman camp, and I will say to you, I have never seen better counselling, never seen better leadership, better orientation, than was put on by our senior and junior students with those freshmen. It opened my eyes to potentialities.

Are we using enough students in our program? What techniques can be devised to add to manpower, with faculty and students?

Another thing I think we haven't done too much, and

maybe we better begin to look at from this manpower point of view is: Are we using the resources of our community? Most of us, I think, do in terms of the religious program. But can not we expand that, perhaps in terms of a placement program? Certainly the resources of the community there -- I am talking about personnel resources now. There may be other areas of our program where we can meet some of our manpower shortage by calling upon folks in the community.

My fourth problem that I suggest we take a look at is: What are the techniques by which we can most effectively train the young men and women who are members of our organization? Of course, we are in a period where there has become a very great emphasis on the formal training of personnel people, the classroom type of thing, the degree type of thing. I happen to be one of the grandfathers in this organization who didn't have the benefit of that kind of training. I came in, as did a great many in our group, by other methods. My training was -- well, we had to fly by the seat of our pants and we learned by making mistakes. The one conviction I have is that this formal, curricular training, is fine if it is blended with a careful program of in-service training. Unless it is, it is too theoretical in my judgment, and pretty unrealistic. So I am suggesting that a major problem in personnel administration is for us to begin to think pretty straight about ways and means of giving our young folks in our organizations an experience which will supplement their formal curricular training, get their feet on the ground, and teach them by doing, under the kind of supervision and guidance that we might supply.

The fifth problem, which is a personal prejudice which you probably won't get to, but one which I just want to throw out is: I have been quite impressed with the fact that personnel work in 1950 owes a tremendous debt to psychology, which we will all grant, I think, but in my judgment we have become lopsided on that score because we are not only concerned with the student as an individual, we are concerned with the student, and increasingly so, in groups. I think it is about time that we said to our colleagues in the field of social science, sociology, social psychology, that the university is a community. Why have they got to turn their attention for their studies further away, to go so far away from the campus? Can we get some of our colleagues to begin to try to understand the university community? We have all the social problems there that exist anywhere else. If we could generally get, begin to understand and begin to get, a body of data from the social scientists which would parallel that of the psychologists, then we are going to be in better shape to meet this very substantial problem of group guidance which, of course, the new vocabulary now calls group dynamics.

Summing it up, and recognizing that each of the workshops is alone to itself and you are going to do just as you darn please anyway, I am suggesting simply, by way of delineating the field, narrowing it down, that we concern ourselves with the problems of communication, coordination, manpower, training, and perhaps this business of getting social science into this picture in some way. Let us keep our emphasis, if we can, upon specific techniques rather than on generalities.

Thank you very much. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Thank you, Blair.

Now that he has outlined a few things, you can go on and do some other things that you want to, but may I ask the chairman to be quite certain that you get those fellows out of there and adjourn by eleven-thirty, because we have to start the luncheons promptly at twelve or else those are going to fall to pieces and if those fall to pieces or get behind then we won't get at our afternoon session in time.

Some questions have been raised about the recordings which were made, and when men can listen to them. I am sorry those machines were tied up pretty much all day yesterday because we were not able to get hold of some of the men who still needed to dictate. I think those records are substantially complete now. Mr. Mahler will be up there all day and at any time that you are free you can go up there and listen to any of the records that you want. This afternoon we are going to try to move some of those machines down into the lobby where they may be more conveniently located for you.

If there are no other announcements, disperse and go to work, and we will meet back here again this afternoon after lunch.

... The conference then divided into five workshop groups in order to discuss "Administration of Student Personnel Programs" ...

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

March 16, 1950

The Convention reconvened at two o'clock, President Neidlinger presiding.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We seem to have a lot of late hangers upstairs, but we should get going because we have a few announcements to make before Mr. Blaesser speaks.

Let me say first, because a number of people have spoken who want to get their hands on the recordings that have been made, particularly the one on "Deferred Rushing," seems to have a lot of people who want to take it home and play it to some student committees. Our original idea was that Fred would take the original recordings back with him and anybody who wanted to borrow them could write in for them, but there seems to be a number of people who want them more rapidly than that and who want to keep them, so I am going to take the original recordings back with me and make arrangements with the local recording studio to play them on some long-playing records and any of you who want to get any one of the recorded topics can, if you will go up to Room B where the recording equipment is and simply put down your name and address and what records you want. I will fairly promptly send you a long playing record, or a tape, whichever you want. The price will be approximately \$3.00, as I understand. I will just send you a bill for it, and if I don't collect, then I will come after you! But it will be possible to get permanent copies of the records on any of those topics that you want, if you will sign up for them in Room B.

MR. ELTON E. WIEMAN (University of Maine): Before making these requests, may we be advised whether or not that material will be in the proceedings?

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: No, the material on those records will not be in the proceedings. I make that decision off hand because yesterday we spent a long time in the Executive Committee trying to figure out how we could cut down the cost of printing the proceedings. So that material simply will not be in there.

Now Fred has some other announcements to be made.

... Announcements by Secretary Turner ...

SECRETARY TURNER: Now this matter of the luncheon programs today seems to have gotten somewhat out of hand, in that some

of them proved to be very popular affairs. There were two circles, 25 or 30 people each in this room that went right up to meeting time. It is quite apparent that there are already three sheets in the wind upstairs there on meetings for tomorrow, partially signed up. One of them is almost full and I think it is quite apparent that some people may want luncheon sessions tomorrow to discuss specific topics.

Carl Knox, are you in the room? Stand up so they can see who you are Carl. If you want a luncheon session for tomorrow noon, tell Carl, and he will set up a sheet on the board and put your name or the name of the topic on top of it. We can handle it just about the same as we did today on that. So see Carl and he will arrange a start for you and get it on the board.

That is all I have.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Perhaps this would be as good an opportunity as any, if anybody has any questions about procedures that they want to raise from the floor. If not, we will consider that you are all well-informed.

Our topic for this afternoon is going to be on "Counseling," and we are very fortunate to have, to brief us on this particular subject, Willard W. Blaesser, who is a specialist on student personnel programs in the U. S. Office of Education, and who is a dean of students from Washington State College, on leave. So he is one of us, and at the same time in a position where he is in touch with all of us. I am very glad to introduce Mr. Blaesser. [Applause]

MR. WILLARD W. BLAESSER (U. S. Office of Education): Mr. Chairman and Deans: Under normal circumstances it would be exceedingly frightening to play the role of counselor to a group of super dean-counselors, but I am not as frightened as I should be, at least not as frightened as I was when Fred Turner sent me an outline of the functions of a counselor -- and I quote: "To inform the newer deans and remind the older ones of some of the things that have been settled in previous discussions and some of the quicksands in which discussion has bogged down; to sketch the background, causes, trends and obstacles that make problems related to this topic perpetual ones; to clear away as much dead wood as is possible; to express forceful principles and conclusions and to challenge the workshop groups to disprove them; to be a stimulant and an irritant; and above all, to shut up at the end of twenty minutes."

That upset me! In terror, I wrote to that greatest of all revolving NABOBs, Scott Goodnight. I have used the word

"revolving" to indicate that he is a NABOB from no matter what angle you look at him. [Laughter] As you know, NABOB stands for "National Association of Best Old Bulls." NADAM accredited that organization in 1947. In 1948, Scott Goodnight changed the title of the organization to "Nefarious Amalgamation of Bastardly Old Bullies." [Laughter] Well, that greatest of all revolving NABOBs responded nobly to my plea for help and wrote to me as follows: "Although you have extremely limited resources, I haven't the slightest doubt but that you will be able to irritate the group adequately. [Laughter] So after you have made your talk, I strongly urge that you avoid the workshop groups and meet me in the tavern for a round or two." [Laughter]

Such reassurance from my boss emeritus brought back my confidence immediately. It occurred to me also that I was extremely well qualified to handle the topic of counseling since I have handled at least five counseling cases since starting to work for Uncle Sam this past September. [Laughter] And I do it by correspondence. It is very, very easy. [Laughter] If you are worried about when to reflect, and when to diagnose, and when to interpret, you at least have two weeks to decide, before you have to answer the letter. So I recommend it as a very easy way of counseling.

More seriously speaking, I did feel uncertain about this assignment, so I did scan many of the proceedings of the past thirty years. I was particularly intrigued by the secretarial notes of the first ten or twelve meetings of the Association. My respect for the pioneers of NADAM has always been high, but it went even higher after this hasty perusal of the minutes. The actual word -- counseling -- was rarely used, but it was crystal clear that these pioneer deans were top-level humanitarians. The fundamental basis of their concern was human relations -- how to assist the individual in understanding himself, in understanding his relations with others, in becoming a better citizen in his college community in preparation for effective citizenship in later life. These deans must have been excellent counselors -- in person-to-person relationships, and in group relationships. They could not have discussed student problems as they did in those early meetings without having been fine counselors. And I can vouch personally for one of them. I have seen Scott Goodnight in action, and I have read and heard testimony from hundreds of students regarding his effectiveness.

I thumbed through the proceedings of the meetings in the 1930's. In much of the material, including the Turner, Gardner and George Small reports of the NADAM functional surveys, the many individual listed functions of the dean of men stood out.

In 1940, Dean Bradshaw's paper included a strong paragraph about the basic role of the dean of men in the college or university. "He is essentially a strategist in the college of organization who seeks to use all arms of the service in the relentless warfare against the impersonalization or mechanization of institutions. He may administer discipline, supervise student activities, advise student leaders, coordinate student welfare agencies or perform and direct guidance functions. He may even make public speeches, collect student loans or encourage alumni. But these are not the distinctive and unique standards of deanly effectiveness. They are raw materials which the dean of men may share with other deans and administrative officers. His is the unique function to add to the value of these materials by re-working them from the point of view of the student as a person, the student whose personal and social development is an end in itself and never to the good dean a mere means to some other end, however significant. This essential marks the surface and becomes the one single and unfailing standard by which all duties of deans must be evaluated."

At the 1947 meeting a sectional group on counseling was established. Counseling was considered under the categories of general, medical, psychiatric and psychological. The emphasis of the discussion was upon the devices used in some of the schools which bring the student to the counselor, whether he wants to come or not.

Now we are up to the 1949 panel and group discussion on counseling which most of you heard. Fred Turner was kind enough to send me the full transcript of the discussion so this gave me an opportunity to tune in on the thinking of you folks last year. You will recall that panel chairman Newhouse led off with the following definition of counseling subscribed to by the panel group in an effort to establish some boundaries for the discussion. "Counseling of students is a relationship between one or more students and a person whose purpose is to assist the student in self understanding and self decision."

Chairman Newhouse pointed out that "counseling by this definition is not the entire student personnel program, that it is probably not a casual conversation between a dean and a student, that it is probably not giving specific information which our secretaries can do twice as well as we can, that it is not giving tests without interpretation of the results, that it is not telling the police how to spell a word."

You will recall that the panel members raised the following questions to get the ball rolling. You may wish to tackle one or two of these questions again this year.

By the way, I am using sort of the shotgun method. I am going to spray forth a lot of questions. The workshop groups will have to pick out certain of the buckshot, I hope not from their skins. Blair Knapp used a rifle this morning, with five well-placed shots. I perhaps should have done the same thing, but I am throwing out the buckshot with a fair amount of gleeful abandon.

The issues raised last year were:

1. Can counseling contribute very much to the development of real maturity and self-direction in students if the social and physical environment of the college fails to provide the chance for students to come to real grips with the twin problems of freedom and responsibility?

2. Is it necessary to have men to counsel the fellows, women to counsel the girls?

3. Is the exercise of firm and decisive authorities in the dean's office inconsistent with counseling? If you wish to include this latter question this year, I suggest that you exclude the discipline phase.

4. Should a dean strive for a single unified integrated approach to counseling; in brief, should he be non-directive, directive, eclectic, or what?

5. Do our internal and external institutional policies limit the application of counseling theory to certain kinds of areas, and if so, to what areas?

6. Perhaps counseling does not include information-giving. How do we correct the great amount of information received by our students from people outside the field of education, and which seem to influence the attitudes and vocational choices of our students?

7. Is counseling done by the specialist? Is counseling done by all teachers? Is there any reconciliation to the question of who does counseling?

8. Who has the responsibility in the counseling session? If not the counselor, what is the counselor's part and how can he allow the students to make a decision yet maintain leadership in the situation? That question was not taken up in the discussion last year. It might be a good one to chew into this year. I would add this to the question -- what do we mean by "maintaining leadership"? Is that a polite word for domination?

9. Can a person who has the authority of discipline at the same time act as a counselor of the students?

In the discussion which followed the raising of these questions, most of the time was spent on the counseling and discipline issue. Many good points were brought out, but I won't attempt to summarize them here. Scott Goodnight has the transcript of this discussion and he may wish to refer to it tonight when he briefs us in the area of discipline.

Regarding the issue of "should men be counseled by men and women by women," there seemed to be general agreement that cross referrals should be made when considered desirable, and that students should have the option of seeking out a counselor of either sex. It was pointed out, however, that we do not have any real evidence on this problem, and this led to strong emphasis on the point that there is a great need for more scientific and objective evaluation of the relative effectiveness of all kinds of counseling; that we need a series of carefully planned studies to give us some objective basis for deciding what kind of counseling can help what kinds of students with what kinds of problems.

The need for these evaluations tied in with the whole issue of directive, non-directive, eclectic, or what? Several people emphasized that you have to use whatever seem to work and that one should not tie himself to a single approach. Again it was emphasized that we really have little basis for generalizing beyond our own experience until we get some hard-boiled objective facts about what works under various circumstances. The problem of what criteria to use in such evaluation of results was given some attention. Certain criteria were listed as relatively easy to get, such as: Improvement of scholarship, participating in extra-curricular activities, keeping out of trouble, etc. The criterion of a basic change in attitudes and fundamental behavior was stressed as much more difficult to get at. The main point was that we cannot prove the values of counseling by what we think is done with the students. We must have more tangible evidence.

Where are we in 1950?

You know, Fred Turner got worried when he heard that I was going through back issues of the proceedings and when I asked him for missing copies, he wrote me and said, "Don't over-burden yourself with preparation, Bill -- you just raise the questions, and let the workshop groups try to find the answers."

So, without one iota of guilt, I am going to raise a few more questions in addition to those just reviewed. And I think I

will raise them in sort of an irritating way. First, let me repeat Dean Newhouse's definition of counseling with the addition of several words to better suit the purpose at hand, to wit: "Counseling is a process involving a purposeful relationship between two or more people in which the focus is upon student growth in self-understanding and self-decision and to which the counselor contributes through insight and skill."

I maintain that if we accept this definition, with its full implication, we most likely then agree that the student has the capacity to take the major responsibility for his learning and for the solution of his educational, vocational and personal adjustment problems; that the student has the inner drives and the capacity for self-development; that good counseling will strengthen the decision-making ability of the student and will enable him to direct his life in more constructive ways.

Do we fully believe that? Is our belief in the worth and dignity of each student more on the verbal level and less evident in our actual operations? Do we really act upon the assumption that the student has the capacity and the right to self-direction -- or do we really believe that his life would be best guided by us? Do we have somewhat of a need and desire to dominate others? -- in a nice way, of course! Are there some types of individual and group situations where we feel that we can be fully democratic, others where we feel we need to set up certain limits and controls? If so, what are they? Again, let's omit discipline. Can we identify and define them, and thus arrive at a better understanding of the dean's variegated role in the area of counseling?

To put it another way, if we are certain of what we believe, are we sure that our attitudes and skills and techniques in working with students are consistent with our beliefs? Our NADAM surveys and discussions over the years have outlined many of our functions and how we carry them out. However, in our person to person, intra-group and inter-group relationships, don't we tend to verbalize and to generalize without tearing apart and analyzing the process itself? Would it be possible for NADAM to set up a small pilot study, with say 8 or 10 deans volunteering to participate and to record and analyze more of the "how" in counseling, the actual process, the "how" in the dean's office, which has a different setting and likely a different selection of students than is found by the specialist in a counseling bureau?

Then too, how about several of us setting aside one afternoon a week for a half year to go to the counseling bureau and to counsel with the run-of-the-mill student who comes there for help. Playing the role of the specialist in that setting with perhaps a different selection of students might prove interesting

and worthwhile. This might not be possible in the smaller institutions, nor necessary. It is in the larger institutions where we tend to lose the feel of what else is going on under the big tent.

These are annoying questions, but how can we dig deeply into the topic of counseling without answering them for ourself? These are lasting questions because the development of a greater understanding of the individual and the group and of how we work with the individual and the group is a continuing process.

Next, why do we counsel students? Herb Wunderlich raised this type of question during the session last year, but time did not permit discussion of it. Again, it is the kind of question that has no easy, final answer. Don't we have to keep plugging away at it, though, gradually defining our large objectives so that we can direct our efforts more effectively toward them? What kind of human beings and citizens are we trying to help develop? Are the systems of counseling in our own institutions based upon carefully worked out and understood objectives, policies and procedures? Are they consistent with the overall objectives and policies of our particular institution? Are our student personnel and counseling objectives and policies understood clearly by our own staff, our teaching faculty, our student leaders, our president? If not, why not? That is a nasty question, isn't it? That just shows what happens to a fellow when he stays away from a campus situation for a few months.

Yet, a fair question would be: Are we thrashing out real objectives, policies and procedures through appropriate student and faculty consideration?

Next, what are we doing on our campuses to follow through on Dean Bradshaw's statement that the dean is essentially a strategist in the college organization who seeks to use all arms of the service in the relentless warfare against the impersonalization or mechanization which tends to develop even in the smaller institutions? Whether or not we have administrative authority, what are we doing to coordinate and to help improve the great amount of individual and group counseling that goes on willy-nilly, for better or for worse, in the various college offices and agencies, in the dormitories, fraternities? This can be a serious problem even on the small campus, to the point where conflicting counsel is given and where the student is fragmented. If we have not done so already, would it be advisable to initiate one or more of the following: A voluntary clearing house of counseling information about the student centered in one office, perhaps our own; a student-faculty advisory committee to help survey the student personnel functions on campus, with emphasis on the corresponding

function of counseling; a case-conference once a week in our office or in the counseling bureau to combine the wits and wisdom of people concerned with a particular student -- the instructor, the academic dean, the faculty advisor, the remedial reading specialist, the vocational counselor -- this case-conference providing also an in-service training function; a voluntary personnel council comprising all personnel officials and teaching faculty interested in meeting regularly to discuss current programs to identify needs, to initiate self-improvements, to work for new counseling services when needed, etc.; a staff seminar twice a month (or you may call it a "coffee clutch," if seminar is too fancy) open to other interested people whether or not administratively related, where the newest developments in individual and group counseling are reported and discussed pro and con, such as the application of certain principles and techniques of individual counseling, the recent findings of the Michigan Institute of Human Dynamics, etc.; a training program for a group of highly selected student counselors who extend carefully defined and restricted counseling services to non-dormitory and non-fraternity students; and so on.

Well, I hope that I have raised enough questions in a sufficiently irritating way to make the next hour or hour and a half rough enough for the chairmen, the experts, and the recorders of the work groups. I confess that I am not going to become a discipline problem for Scott Goodnight in the tavern. [Laughter] I am going to join your discussion groups to learn the answers which I don't have for the questions which I have raised.

Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Blaesser.

Gentlemen, now you have some 25 or 30 questions that you can try to discuss in the next hour and a half. If all of you try to give your opinions on them, you are not going to get very far. Nevertheless, you will clear away at least some of the things about which you are in doubt.

I think I will exercise the prerogative which the President has, because he has control of the microphone at least, to just add one thought to the thing, before you break up into these sessions, because I think that the most helpful thing that could happen to me during the next hour, would be if somebody could tell me the proper counseling approach to the indifferent student. I have a great deal of confidence that when I know what a boy wants to accomplish, or when I know what he should want to accomplish, and he is interested in finding out how to do it, that I know the answer. But the thing I do not know the answer to, and the thing

which is the most common problem which I meet, is the indifferent student, the one who doesn't want to improve, the one who doesn't want to develop himself, who is in college marking time until he gets old enough to work; and if you can apply your counseling problems to that man, and your discussion of it, I think you will be very helpful to most of the people in the discussions.

Let's break up now, to the various groups, and go out into the cold snows of Virginia.

... The conference then divided into five workshop groups in order to discuss "Counseling" ...

THURSDAY EVENING SESSION

March 16, 1950

The convention reconvened at seven-thirty-five o'clock, President Neidlinger presiding.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: To work, to work, gentlemen. John, do you have some announcements to make, first?

MR. HOCUTT: With the idea in mind of avoiding a little of this Texas weather we have got here in Virginia [laughter], Group 1 will meet tonight in the staff dining room. Group 2 will meet in the front part of the main dining room. There will be a partition dividing the room into two parts. I am sorry to say that groups 4 and 5 will still have to meet in the Inn, but the bus will shuttle you over to avoid the snow. The bus will be waiting out at the main entrance to the Lodge, as soon as we finish the briefing session, and will make as many trips as are necessary to get Groups 4 and 5 over to the Inn, and will bring you back at the conclusion of the workshop sessions.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I am sorry, gentlemen, that these emergency measures were necessary. I had wired Hanover to have a hundred pair of skis sent down here, but unfortunately they could not arrive in time. [Laughter]

Our subject for tonight's meetings is "Discipline," which is something in which we are all concerned, and in which we are perhaps not as interested always as we would like to be, or wish we didn't have to be so interested in it. The man who is going to brief you on it is Scott Goodnight of the University of Wisconsin. I won't even attempt to introduce Scott to the members of this organization. Those of you who haven't been fortunate enough to know him before, will know him after his talk, and you will admire him as much as the rest of us have for years to come. Scott. [Applause]

MR. S. H. GOODNIGHT (University of Wisconsin): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: I am not dean at Wisconsin any more, as you might have inferred from the words of our President. They call me "Emeritus Dean," but with my fellow NABOB Joe Bursley, I abhor the term "emeritus."

I don't know whence he got his dislike for it, but I know where I got mine. It was a dozen years ago, when this organization met in Madison, and we were addressed by President Emeritus E. A. Birge, and he gave us a definition of the term. Some of you old-timers will remember it. He said it was derived from two Latin

words, "ex" meaning "out of," and "meritus" meaning "deserved." Hence, freely translated, the guy is out of his job and jolly well deserves to be. [Laughter]

When our efficient secretary first wrote me and asked me to accept this assignment to talk on discipline, of all things, I politely but firmly declined for two reasons. In the first place, at that time he had in mind calling those who were to brief the assemblage on these various topics, experts, and I objected to the connotation of that term. In most recent definitions I have heard of an expert is a guy who blows in, blows off, and blows out. [Laughter] For the second reason, I told him frankly I didn't know anything about the subject. When a man has messed with it for something like thirty years, with as little success as I managed to do, no other conclusion can be drawn. [Laughter]

But Fred is a persistent rascal. As Mr. Barnard advised yesterday morning, he works from the bottom up, and so he began on me. [Laughter] He said he would be perfectly willing to drop the term "expert," and furthermore said that our stern prexy had ordained that I should accept this, or else.

So I did so with much reluctance and with a mental reservation that I should talk on the subject of what I don't know about discipline, because that will give me such tremendous latitude.

Discipline, in university and college. When Mrs. Winthrop Worthington Witherspoon was asked about her ancestry, she gurgled, "Oh dear me, yes, our family goes way back to, well, I don't remember just to whom, but anyway we have been descending for centuries." [Laughter] And so have disciplinary problems in the university and college.

If you go back and read about the mediaeval universities of Europe, disciplinary problems, on down through the Renaissance period and later centuries -- disciplinary problems. If you peak into the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Governors of Harvard College, 250 or 300 years ago -- disciplinary problems. And when you burrow into it a little bit further you will realize that those old, former day students who were hell raisers of the highest order -- they stopped at nothing short of -- well they didn't stop at anything! [Laughter] Mayhem, murder, rape and arson. [Laughter] So of course they were a lot worse than our present day students. Anyway, I don't remember any arson cases. [Laughter]

Discipline. What is it for? The first question -- and

I am just going to ask questions, I am not going to try to tell you anything. There isn't a more threadbare subject in the whole field than this. We have been thrashing it out ever since 1919, the first time that this Association ever met. There is positively nothing new to say about it. So I am merely going to expose my ignorance by asking questions, and let you do the fighting about it.

What is the primary purpose of discipline in a college or university? The primary purpose, the fundamental one -- is it punishment? An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, the vengeance of organized society on a transgressor? Is it the reform of the transgressor by kindly counsel and by the application of sweetness and light, convincing him of the errors of his ways, and leading him back into the paths of righteousness? Is it to be a deterrent example, an illustration of what society visits upon the offender, and go thou and don't do likewise because verily I say unto you, if ye offend a dire punishment shall be meted out to you? Or is the purpose, the primary purpose, the protection of the good name of the institution, so that it will stand well in the opinion of the public, so they will realize that here at Good Old Siwash we uphold standards, high standards of conduct and of integrity, so that the legislature will be far more likely to appropriate us funds, and fathers and mothers will be more likely, more willing, to entrust their sons and daughters to our care?

Which of these is it, or are there other purposes you have in mind? Please don't come back with any composite answer, "Why these are all purposes of discipline." That won't do. What we want to know in this case is which is the primary purpose. These purposes that I have mentioned, while not completely mutually exclusive of each other, nevertheless they do have certain conflicting areas.

If you punish by expulsion, throwing the fellow out, you can't reform him that way, although you might, by so doing, be protecting the good name of the institution and possibly setting a slightly deterrent example to others who might be inclined to go the same way.

Or, if, after a very grave offense, you keep him in the institution in order to reform him, then of course you are running the risk of not setting a deterrent example, and of bringing upon your devoted institution the carping criticism of all sorts of external agencies who insist that you are coddling criminals in the institution.

The question is, then, what is the primary purpose of discipline? By selecting one as the primary and fundamental one,

you automatically relegate the others to secondary and tertiary positions.

Shall discipline be severe or mild? There is such a distance between great severity of discipline on one hand and severe mildness and laxity of discipline on the other, that it is hard to call the two by the same names. I would like to tell you a couple of stories to illustrate the two, but I think I haven't time. But I will narrate one incident.

A Jewish lad came from his native Russia many years ago and began his American life as a pack peddler in the hills of Green County in southwestern Wisconsin. Solomon Levitan was his name. Sol was thrifty, he was industrious, he was enterprising, he had lots of push and go and was reasonably honest, and he rose in the world. Somewhat past middle age he was the President of a bank in Madison, Wisconsin, and then subsequently, for four consecutive terms he was elected to the State Treasurership of Wisconsin. Old Sol's pithy sayings and wisecracks are legendary in Wisconsin, and one of them that I always liked immensely was, "You bet you, honesty is the best policy. I know, because I have tried it both ways." [Laughter]

There are advantages and disadvantages to severity of discipline. There are advantages and disadvantages in laxity of discipline. I know, because I have tried it both ways. [Laughter]

Somewhere, somewhere in between these two extremes--very severe, very mild -- there must be a golden mean, a zone, be it a narrow one, but a zone within which the proper kind of discipline resides, a discipline that is severe enough, without being too severe, mild enough without being too mild.

Gentlemen, the second task that I lay down for your councils this evening is to go to work with square, transit and compass and locate that zone exactly. Some of us have been groping for it for decades and haven't found it, but we expect you to come up with the correct answer tonight. Just where is that zone of the right kind of discipline that it really does the business and at the same time does not bring the disadvantageous effects of too severe and too mild discipline?

Who should handle discipline? That is an old-timer too. Of course historically it was the faculty. Faculties, whole faculties, have sat for hours debating questions of disciplinary cases. When that became too cumbersome, they passed the burden over to presidents and the college deans, and they struggled with it for many decades. Then back in the early part of this century, a new academic creature was invented. He was called the dean of men.

Thereupon the presidents and the college deans, with joy some enthusiastic unanimity, proceeded to dump all burdens of discipline upon this new creature, the dean of men. And we accepted it. We didn't know any better. We struggled along with it for a number of years, but finally that became too onerous and we began to cry for help.

I well remember -- I think it was in about 1922 at the meeting of this Association in Atlanta, Georgia, I got a brilliant idea from the Conduct Committee. I mulled it over on the train on the way home. I went into the president and sold him on the idea and appointed for the first time at Wisconsin what you might almost call a professional disciplinary committee, or a Student Conduct Committee as we really called it. We had a lawyer, professor of the Law School, as chairman to keep us free from legal entanglements, to keep everybody advised of his legal rights and limitations as well. We had a physician who was an excellent psychiatrist, as a member of the committee to spot cases of physical and mental disorder as they might appear before us. We had a professor of sociology who had made a life study of criminology and penology. We had a young man, a very young man, from one of the Departments to bring us the fresh point of view of youth. And we had the dean of women in cases concerning women, and the dean of men in cases concerning men. We thought, and I think yet, that was one of the best Conduct Committees we ever had at Wisconsin.

But what happened? Three years later along came a new president, and he took a dim view of professionals in that capacity, and replaced them with four common, ordinary, kitchen garden variety professors, [Laughter] and the thing went down pretty badly.

We had to have more help and we began to expand the agencies to assist in disciplinary matters. That process went on for a number of years. It had reached, I thought, pretty vast proportions when I left back four or five years ago. But the other day I went up to my old office and asked my successor, my revered successor, Paul Trump, what the picture looked like now. And he gave it to me. I will just sketch it very briefly.

The departments take care of cheating, cribbing, and plagiarism cases themselves. But they report to the student personnel committee and any appeal from the decision of the department goes to this appeals committee, that student personnel committee. It is a very large committee composed of the president, the deans, and all the counseling officers, and so forth, a total of 29 members on that one committee.

The Committee on Student Life and Interest has charge in

the field of organizations, social organizations, clubs, fraternities, sororities, magazine staffs, publication staffs, forensic organizations, dramatics, and so forth. It is a very large organization. There are five sub-committee chairmen who are members of the committee. The dean of men, the dean of women and three students, that is ten on the major committee, then there are these five sub-committees that have about five members each, so all in all that runs to something like thirty-five members on that committee.

The Student Conduct Committee, survivor of the one that I founded way back in 1922, to pass on offenses by individuals who have been cribbing and cheating, has, I think, about five men and two or three students. I am not sure about that.

Then there is the Student Court, which is a pretty large organization. It has as its purview the misdemeanors in student parking, smoking in the buildings, violation of the student association regulations regarding elections, and so forth.

SGA similarly has a big judiciary committee. I don't know how many members. In the men's halls we have two student conduct committees, one made up of students, the other made up of dormitory fellows. Then we have an inter-fraternity judiciary committee that takes care of violations of rushing and pledging rules and all that sort of thing. Finally, a sort of a supreme court over all, a faculty appeals committee, to which cases may be appealed from any of these other judicial bodies.

Lastly, we have the University police force, [Laughter] a force of officers in uniform with cars, who maintain order on the campus and who turn over their cases to the proper one of these organizations.

That is a total of ten organizations. If they average twelve members, and I suspect they do, that is about 120 people. Has that gone too far? I would like to have you consider that. [Laughter] Would it be a lot smarter if we erased that and took all those committees out and appointed one committee, say of 15, 18, 20 members? If it is necessary to take cheating in one category, you could divide that up among some sub-committees of that general committee. Would it be better? Would it be better to have just one big committee handle the whole thing, or wouldn't it? That is another question I would like to have your opinion on.

Then of course there is this matter of all-faculty disciplinary bodies, all-student disciplinary bodies, or a mixture of the two, faculty and student.

These questions are old. They have all been discussed over and over again, but I am raising them again because there is never any agreement on them.

Shall the dean of men be the disciplinary officer? That is a lulu. You can get up an argument on that at any session of this convention. I can argue both sides of that question. I have heard them both argued pretty well.

The two men who held the positions of undisputed leadership in the early days of this organization held divergent views on that subject. The one grand old man was Tommy Arkle Clark of Illinois, the first dean of men. Arkle was heart and soul a disciplinarian. He was discipline at Illinois for decades. And he did it joyously, not from any sadistic point of view at all, but because he really thought, really believed that a great deal of good could be accomplished for students by a disciplinarian who knew his stuff. Arkle always contended that his life long friends were in large part men whom he had first met in a disciplinary capacity. He contended further that no dean of men could do an honest, full time, whole job unless he were the disciplinary officer of his institution.

The other grand old man was Dean Stanley Coulter of Purdue, the great old idealist. He would have none of it. Coulter ruled by moral suasion. If any practice showed signs of developing at Purdue that he didn't like, he managed to get into casual conversation with some student leaders, and after discussing the weather and the crops, and the chances of the Boiler-makers for the game next Saturday afternoon, the conversation drifted around to the practice in question and Stanley expressed the opinion that that was unfortunate because he believed it was bad for Purdue, and the boys went out and said: "Listen, fellows, the dean thinks that is poor stuff. Let's cut it out." And they did. Whether it was all just that simple and whether it was all just that effective, of course I can't say, but those of you who, with me, have sat under that man's tutelage, who have felt the spark of inspiration and of high resolve kindled in your own bosom under the influence of that magnetic, that idealistic eloquence of his, can believe a lot of it.

Which is the better method? We have argued that up and down for years. Many believe, with Clark, that the dean should be the chief disciplinarian advisor of the institution, the chief disciplinary officer of the institution. Others believe, as Coulter did, that the office of discipline, the position of disciplinary officer, is a sad deterrent to the complete confidence and trust that the student body must place in the dean, if the dean is to be as effective a dean and counselor as he should be. So you

can argue that question up one side and down the other. I don't know how you will settle it finally.

Here is a small question. Perhaps many of you haven't encountered it. I have, and I know that it has been encountered in some other places. Our modern personnel systems bring experts into the disciplinary picture -- physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, counselors and so on. If they are on a committee, has the committee a right to require that they give full and complete information to the committee, which would be necessary for the committee to reach a just judgment in a case?

You will probably have difficulty if you do. A physician who has as a patient a student who is before the disciplinary committee will refuse to tell you whether that student is or is not afflicted with a venereal disease, whether a young woman who is suspected of sexual irregularities is, or is not, pregnant. He will tell you that the code of ethics of his profession requires absolute confidential relationship on his part. He will not divulge it. A psychiatrist will throw the book at you with psychological terms -- manic depressive, dementia praecox, schizophrenia, psychopath, and so forth -- but he won't tell you whether--he may not, some may, but I have encountered one who would not--a student is really a dangerously psychopathic case and a man who should be removed from the environment because he is a positive menace, or whether he is only potentially dangerous, or whether he is just a harmless, mild psychopathic type. He may tell you the latter, but he probably won't tell you the former.

If these members of your committee won't give you the professional information that you feel you, or the committee, must have, who is going to make the decision in the case? Are you going to leave it to the physician and the psychiatrist? If you do, if you have to do that, why bother anybody else with it? Just hand it to him in the first place. That is a question of a small side issue, but I have encountered it and I know others have.

What about penalties? We have abandoned three that they used to practice in mediaeval times -- beating with a rod or a whip, confining in stocks, and throwing into the cart as you are or university jail on bread and water for a few days. Sometimes I have wondered if we were smart in abandoning those altogether. [Laughter]

But the others we have brought on down -- expulsion, for example. We haven't expelled a student at the University of Wisconsin for over half a century. Way back in the 1890's the Regents passed a high-powered resolution that before a student might be expelled a hearing had to be set so many days in advance,

the president of the university had to preside, the parents of the culprit should be advised in writing and urged to be present if possible. He might have legal counsel, and so forth. Well nobody cared to monkey with that buzz saw so there hasn't been an expulsion at Wisconsin for over fifty years. [Laughter]

Of course, candor compels me to admit that there have been a heck of a lot of indefinite suspensions, and we never got around to re-admitting again, but we never expelled anybody. [Laughter]

Of course there is definite suspension for a quarter, semester, a year. There is the matter of fines. You can collect small fines, a dollar or two for parking or traffic penalty, and that sort of thing, fines in the form of cancellation of credit for a course, requirement of so many additional credits before graduation for dishonesty in class work, and so on. But you will find that you probably couldn't fine a student \$40.00 for a fist fight. But there is some use for fines.

Disciplinary probation ordinarily doesn't mean a great deal to a fellow at any rate at first, but of course if he is caught in a second misdemeanor when he is under disciplinary probation then surely it has a double wallop and there is that mild slap on the wrist known as a reprimand. One that I have used a lot with very great effectiveness -- I don't know whether the rest of you do or not -- is communication with the parents. A student would do pretty nearly anything else rather than have his father written about what he had done.

Of late we have come to a new technique entirely, something we didn't know about in the old days at all -- counseling in the modern technical sense. [Laughter] We have discussed that a lot in recent sessions of this Association. As Bill Blaesser mentioned this afternoon, we discussed it last year at a panel over which Dean Newhouse presided. It has been discussed a great deal.

At Minnesota Dean Williamson has been doing a great deal along that line. They have been experimenting with it for the last nine or ten years, and the last four or five years they have begun to handle all disciplinary cases through counseling. They have a new book out, Dean Williamson and his associate Dean Foley, who is the disciplinary counselor for the University of Minnesota. If this book had been out any length of time, and I thought any number of you had seen it, I shouldn't be saying anything about it. As it is I am going to advertise it a little. Ed, how about a little commission on the side? It is a very excellent book, "Counseling and Discipline."

I am not going to be brash enough to attempt to review this book for you with the author present, but there are just a few little passages that I should like to read, which will give you his philosophy.

First premise: "The rationale for such a conception of discipline stems from the fact that the school or university is not a penal institution but is rather a training institution, not only with regard to vocations and citizenship rights as well as political orientation, but also in the development of those personal habits which are congruent with the rights and privileges of others who likewise wish to learn and to exercise their own rights. Because of the fact that schools and colleges are training institutions, they must minimize punishment for its own sake and maximize counseling to facilitate using the student's re-learning potentialities."

Another passage: "The individualized treatment or rehabilitation of the student offender whose personality development deviates from the social norms does not ignore the seriousness of the offense not its affect upon other students and upon the institution itself. But, as we shall see later, the main purpose of disciplinary counseling is to alleviate the cause of misbehavior so that these causes will no longer operate, so that it will no longer be necessary for the student to offend society. The purpose is to cure and not to punish. The student who gets into difficulties of one sort or another is treated as an individual who needs special teaching assistance, and the whole process is organized to take account of the student's assets and liabilities and thus to effect his rehabilitation within the limits of his potentialities."

"It should be clearly borne in mind that the purpose and nature of any disciplinary action stems from the broader philosophy undergirding and determining the character of the entire disciplinary program. Disregarding certain infrequent situations in which the security and protection of the institution are paramount, by all odds the major purpose of disciplinary action takes on the character of rehabilitation. The implicit assumption of this concept of disciplinary action is that if rehabilitation is effectively achieved, then the misbehavior in question will disappear, or at least will not reappear again in a similar social context."

"The guiding principle. A basic dimension in any counseling point of view is the underlying philosophy of education in a democratic society. In the present case, the student personnel point of view is the undergirding thought structure of our concept of disciplinary counseling. Adherence to this educational

philosophy makes it incumbent upon the institution to regard the student as a dynamic and total personality in the process of development, and not as a fragmented or fragmentable individual."

Finally, as to the success of the method, they say, with perfect modesty: "We have selected some cases which 'did not turn out well' because of our own counseling deficiencies or because of other factors unidentifiable to us. By this device we believe we are indicating that not all disciplinary cases are brought to a successful conclusion, and accordingly we are more truly representing the actual realities to the reader. In some other illustrative cases the situation has been closed with what appeared to us to be a satisfactory termination status from the standpoint of the adjustment of the individual concerned. No doubt our plan to follow and to evaluate these cases will reveal that many of those we first thought unsuccessful will turn out to be satisfactorily adjusted and in many other cases the reverse will be true."

The assumption then is that the student should be retained in the institution and should be counseled in order to reform him.

I think it would be awfully interesting to hear a debate between Dean Williamson on one hand and a very hard-boiled old dean of the college of Letters and Science at Wisconsin. He is emeritus now, but during his active years -- and they were many -- he was one of the most powerful and influential figures on the campus. He had a very tart bit of verbiage and he is quite a debater. He would take issue with this whole thesis wholeheartedly. He would insist, as I have heard him insist many times, that a university, an institution of learning, is not a hospital for -- I said he used tart language -- morons, for imbeciles and for criminals. Throw them out, off with their heads! Get rid of them, they don't belong in the institution and they are a menace to the real work of the institution. A university is an institution of learning for the training of those who are mentally competent, and the presence of these morons and imbeciles and criminals in the institution is a detriment, positive detriment, to the real purpose of it. They form an undue burden upon the instructional staff, they clutter up and impede the progress of every class of which they are a member, and it is all wrong to keep them in the institution. Send them out, and let them be sent to institutions such as psychiatric hospitals or clinics, or reform schools, or what have you, places that are prepared to take care of cases of that kind.

Fred, I recommend that debate as a number on the program for next year. I think it would be awfully interesting. [Laughter]

Of course this book, like all books in our field, is pretty well weighted with statistics, and I never use statistics in any kind of a speech for the reason that the ladies, God bless them, have no interest in them whatever, and the men don't understand them. [Laughter]

In support of that latter contention, I cite the instance of the Door County Board of Supervisors in annual meeting assembled up in Jacksonport one night, to hear the annual reports of their county health officers. The county health officer made what he said was a splendid report and he congratulated himself and all concerned on the fact that the death rate in Door County had fallen during the past year to an all-time low of 4.7 per thousand. After he had finished his report and taken his departure, the chairman was addressed by one of the members, and the member said, "Ezry, what did the Doc mean a while ago when he said the death rate had gone down to 4.7 per thousand?"

The chairman said, "Well, Cy, I ain't quite sure I know just what he meant, but I figured out that probably he meant that out of every thousand folks in the county, four of them died and seven more was at the point of death." [Laughter]

A colored preacher had resigned his position with one church and was moving to another. The congregation gathered to bid him farewell. The old deacon who had been selected as the speaker of the occasion arose and said, "Brethren and Sistern, Brother Johnson has been our preacher now for ten years and now he is going away. He is leaving on the afternoon train and youall has asked me to give him a little momentum." [Laughter]

Gentlemen of the panels, that is what I have been trying to do for your discussion of discipline this evening. Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Dean Turner has asked me to let you know that the mimeographed lists of the men who are present at this affair are now available up at the registration desk.

I can't help but let you leave with one parting word of advice, and that is that when you get into these discussion groups, I hope for your own protection that when you speak you will make clear those things which you do because you believe they are the right things to do, and distinguish them from those which you do because your president insists on it or because the Board of Regents might fire you if you didn't. Go to it.

... The conference then divided into five workshop groups in order to discuss "Discipline" ...

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

March 17, 1950

The convention reconvened at nine-fifteen o'clock, President Neidlinger presiding.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We have quite a schedule this morning, and since we have to be out there to have our pictures taken at eleven o'clock, we better get under way.

This morning's meeting is devoted to hearing the reports from the different assemblies on Workshop No. 1 and Workshop No. 2. If the chairman will come forward when we call for him, and speak through the microphone, I think it will be more convenient; or if you have shoved that job off on your secretary, let him come up at the right time.

The first report will be from Group 1, the chairman of which was Dean Hawthorne of Alfred University.

MR. E. L. HAWTHORNE (Alfred University): Too bad I didn't know that the recorder could take my place on this. It would perhaps have been fortunate for me.

We spent the hour profitably, we think, and discussed the matter of student government under two headings: The function of the groups, (1) organization and (2) areas of representation.

In terms of formal organization we found, as you yourselves know, that apart from the general governing body, called the Student Senate, there would almost always be either parallel organizations or subsidiary organizations such as the Women's Student Government, and perhaps a Men's Student Government; that the women's student government was generally stronger and more effective in its own purposes at least; that there was a possibility of not necessarily conflict but a lack of coordination between the various subsidiary governments and that because of the lack of organization there had come into being in some of the smaller institutions a type of student affairs committee which, in effect, is not a legal governing body, but more a representative body that would bring together leaders from activities, leaders from living units, leaders from the actual formal governments, and that these student affairs committees could be a clearing house of information, a clearing house of opinion -- faculty opinion as well as student opinion, because generally there was faculty representation as well as student representation; and that in general institutions where communication is relatively easy and simple between individuals that such a student affairs committee was an effective means

of making student self-government work more effectively.

There was some discussion of organization of classes and whether possibly some government representation should be based on either the principle of class organization, on the one hand, or more ideally the college as a whole, on the other hand.

There was also the possibility advanced that student government representation might be based on activity groups, such as clubs, and a warning was voiced against that type of representation.

In terms of the other main topic of representation, there was a good deal of pro and con so far as factual numbers are concerned, about how big committees should be and how much representation there should be from faculty and from students. There was no consensus upon that of course, because each institution is different and the particular circumstances within which an institution is working and its own history and tradition very often make the factual representation different from place to place.

There was some discussion of student publications and the question of control, the question of review, and particularly in terms of the possible damage to college public relations, for instance, that could come from ill-advised or poorly judged written materials in the student publication. The question of review naturally is one which involves democratic responsibility and we, I think, came to the conclusion that with a good program of education for the new student leaders for the student leaders on the campus, and a recognition by all concerned that what people do, whether it is in publications or whether it is in sports, or whatever it may be, does represent the group as a whole, that there could be a resolution of that problem of editorial responsibility in particular.

Then of course, this matter of communication with the faculty came into it, and it was agreed that generally speaking the working relationship between faculty and student groups was a very effective means of educating the faculty itself. We actually didn't get to the problem of evaluation though we recognized that that is one basic point we must come to terms with.

The whole thing might be summarized, I suppose, in a simple statement that the thing that we are doing in student government is the kind of thing we are doing in the college. We are educating people for responsible citizenship in a democracy. Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Thank you very much, Dean Hawthorne.

The next report from Group 2 is by Dean Gilliam of Washington and Lee University.

MR. FRANK J. GILLIAM (Washington and Lee University): The discussion in Group 2 was based largely on the thesis that it is desirable to transfer to students as much responsibility for their own government as they can and will wisely undertake. May I say here, if you have some natural wonder as to how a few of these points that I am going to present got under that heading, why you just be polite.

Under the matter of finances, the first thing that was taken up, 14 institutions, approximately half the group, reported that the entire responsibility for the allocation and distribution of funds for the operation of student activities was placed in student hands. Most of the other institutions had faculty or administrative contact with the operation. Twenty institutions reported the financing of such activities by a required sum collected by the institution. Three reported voluntary participation in collection by the students, and one institution a combination of the two methods.

Under discipline, we got a little bit on last night's topic, in so far as student responsibility came into the picture. There was further evidence of increasing degree of student responsibility in connection with student conduct. A small number of institutions turned over this function almost completely to students and appeared well satisfied with the results. Practically all institutions reported the sharing of responsibility with students. There was general recognition of the great difficulty in securing an adequate functioning system of reporting misconduct. Under the heading of selection of student government, eight institutions reported they are selecting primarily by classes; six by fraternities and non-fraternity groups; seven by representation of general campus organizations; and two through community government involving representation of faculty, students and employees.

Two institutions reported success with a preferential system designed to prevent representations being limited to one party.

The faculty rating system in discussing this matter as an aspect of student responsibility, fourteen institutions reported as having tried the plan, with only two expressing satisfaction with the results. A plan of sampling graduating seniors shortly after graduation was reported as operating more objectively and with the benefit of a better prospective.

Overloading of student leaders, the prevalence of this

situation was recognized as generally creating a difficulty. No particular formula for success was evolved, but 75 per cent of the institutions represented demanded a higher standard of academic qualification for key officers, than for general participation in student activities.

The carry-over of responsibility in passing authority from one student group to another. This was generally recognized as a problem, with three special plans reported as offering something of success.-- a retreat for a weekend with the old and new governing council attending, the old and new councils serving concurrently for a month, and third, a term of office running from February to February, using old officers as guides.

Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: The middle-sized-bear group will be reported by Dean Rece of Emory University.

MR. E. H. RECE (Emory University): Gentlemen, Dean Musser started Group 3 on its discussion of student government by describing the student congress at Bucknell, made up of fourteen students elected from the student body, four faculty members, and four representatives from the horrible administration. He felt that the congress was working very well on his campus, and surely such body appears to have value as a means of communication and coordination.

Fortunately the discussion became general almost immediately. Dean Musser was called on to explain in detail the working of his congress, and attention became focused rather early: however, on the question of whether we are being honest with our students in representing student government to them as democratic, argument was presented that since student government does not have final authority in student affairs, it is a misrepresentation to students to claim that it is democratic. Discussion of this question went far afield, producing a chart of lines of authority, and a general agreement that students do not and cannot have final authority even on extra-curricular affairs on the campus.

No doubt I am presumptuous in saying there was general agreement on anything, but since I have used the phrase, I will be brash enough to say I sensed at least a majority agreement on several points.

(1) As I have said before, the students cannot have final authority. At least we all recognize the facts of life.

(2) We deplore any unrealistic interpretation of student government by the press which would give the public the idea that the phrase "student government" means that students should have such authority.

(3) We are not enthusiastic about students who feel they are called by some higher power to direct the wayward steps of the faculty, the administration and the trustees.

(4) We still feel that students can and should govern their own affairs within constitutional limits determined by the consent of the governed, on the one hand, and the policies of the university on the other. Furthermore, we believe such a student government can be an exercise in practical democracy, whether it is democratic or not.

(5) We confess and repent our sin in not making clear to the students and to the press or other interested segments of the public exactly what the limits are within which the student government can function.

The group also spent considerable time discussing the limitations placed on student government and deans by the faculty. A number of the deans present felt that they were definitely handicapped, if not hamstrung, by faculty action, taken without consideration of, or concern for, student government. On the first show of hands, the majority of us felt that we were not responsible to the faculty. The student activities and affairs were in our hands without interference from the faculty. On consideration of the question of academic probation however most of us realized that in this particular, at least, we were administering a faculty regulation. Obviously then the faculty has the power to regulate student affairs. My own reaction possibly was echoed elsewhere. I began to hope very fervently that my faculty continues to slumber peacefully. [Laughter]

We also spent some time discussing activities' fees. We found virtually all institutions represented collected moneys for student activities in some manner. In most cases this was through an activities' fee. In most cases, again, a definite part of this fee, or a separate fee, was collected for athletics. In some cases the fee was prorated among participating activities before collection. In most cases a student, or student-faculty, council or committee allocated the funds resulting from the fees. In some cases, activities were supported by an appropriation from the school, usually in cases where the fee is not a specified amount, but included in a tuition charge.

A number of questions were raised only to be left

dangling in the air. One such question concerned continuity of membership in student government, a problem apparently that Group 2 worried about too. More difficult, no doubt, was the question, how to arouse interest in student government?

If I may be pardoned a closing observation, I feel that we should recognize the fact that the problems of student government are in large part reflections of the problems of state and national government. Our student governments may not be democratic, and I for one feel that we should be reasonably honest with our students. Surely we should not tell them student government is democratic when it is not. On the other hand, whenever Emory's student government becomes as democratic as Georgia's, I shall take all possible steps to do away with student government. [Laughter]

Again, our student governments surely suffer from a lack of interest on the part of the governed, just as someone pointed out in our discussion, as few as 15 per cent vote on some campuses. This is deplorable, and we are challenged to do all we can to arouse interest in student government. On the other hand, such a state isn't democratic and it isn't commendable, but it surely is American.

Our group was for student government, government by, of and for the students, within realistic limits set by administrative and faculty policies, and with as broad a field as possible, free to the students to learn by making mistakes; but we were not sure just how to set up such a government so that it would arouse interest in the students, have continuity in personnel, and be truly representative of the students; nor did we agree on just where the limits of such a government's field of authority and responsibility can be, or should be, fixed.

Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Do you want to have a rebuttal, Willis?

MR. WILLIS M. TATE (So. Methodist University): I want to call attention to the fact that the reference to Georgia's politics was not the University of Georgia, but the state of Georgia. [Laughter]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: See that the record has that statement.

We now come to those very small factories which have between five and ten thousand employees, and we will ask Dean Deakins of the Illinois Institute of Technology to give that report.

MR. C. E. DEAKINS (Illinois Institute of Technology): We had two pinch-hitters on our team, Dean Pitre of MIT served as recorder for Dean Gluck, and Dean Kirwan had not arrived at the time we started our meeting and our group voted to have Don DuShane on the Board of Experts, so they could put him on the pan for some of the things that he told us in his general session.

We began our session with the question: What is the purpose of student government? And the concept of student government implying (1) student political activity, (2) student government as a bargaining agency, a union so to speak, with the faculty and administration, (3) as a laboratory for political experience.

Those three concepts were thoroughly discussed and the consensus of the group was that the student government basically fulfills all three functions, and not any one specifically.

The problem of communication with the students, including the role of the student newspaper, was debated at some length.

Corrective measures were proposed when student leadership became a detriment to the institution, on the basis that checking irresponsible members of a college community was not necessarily undemocratic, such corrective features having its counterpart in our own local governments, that is, the grand jury and so forth.

Much of the difficulty in student government is traceable to the lack of good communication between students, faculty and administration. This problem is particularly acute on our larger campuses. A positive approach to solve the problem of communication and to improve the value judgments of student leaders was suggested. This took the form of student-faculty-administration committees, in areas affecting the students' welfare and education.

A leadership conference comprised of old and new student officers, faculty and administration, held in a two-day camp preceding the opening of college, was successful in promoting and developing responsibility in student leaders on one of our campuses that was represented in our meeting.

Improving the means of communication between faculty, administration and the students will help towards the goal of

better understanding on the part of the students and their leaders. It will not, however, insure the university against the mistakes of judgment which may be made from time to time by our student leaders.

I didn't take a poll of what our group thought of student government, but I would assume that I would have had somewhat the same reply that a certain reporter had when he asked a certain famous individual what he thought of sin. His short comment was he was for it. I believe if I had asked our group to vote on what they thought of student government, they would have said, "We are for it."

Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: The colleges of largest enrollment, we have the man from General Motors, Dean Erich A. Walter of Michigan.

MR. ERICH A. WALTER (University of Michigan): Thirty-five members attended the meeting. Our recorder was Dean Harold W. Melvin of Northeastern University, who shares the responsibility for this report with me; our experts Dean Frank C. Baldwin of Cornell University, Dean Paul L. Trump of the University of Wisconsin, and Dean O. D. Roberts of the University of Oklahoma.

Although the discussion began in terms of Dean DuShane's "trichotomy" areas in which the students can be given full responsibility, areas in which they enjoy joint responsibility, and areas in which they are consulted, Aristotle's influence in our universities today immediately showed its force and proved that among the institutions represented no such division existed.

Some of us who depend upon student groups to raise their own funds for activities, including student government, by staging fairs, dances, movies and other money-making affairs, looked with envy upon our sister institutions that collect by compulsory means or by free-will collection literally hundreds of thousands of dollars annually to finance the total student program of activities. However, these institutions agreed that even though a sufficient sum of money made the operation of the student program easier, it was obviously no guarantee, as many students believe it to be, that a rich budget assures sound student representation.

Dean Trump, University of Wisconsin, speaking to the point of shared responsibility wanted to define more sharply what we mean by student government. The overall governing student board, he felt, lacked the support both of faculty members and of

students and did not have much effect on the campus. He emphasized the possibility of the grievance and political aspects developing from overall student governments seeking support and publicity. In general he believed the smaller groups to be more effective. He was further of the opinion that faculty members would welcome more student participation in mutual problems but that the question of how students should be selected has not been ironed out. He thought that a student sense of community well-being was of more importance than a sense of governing.

Dean Stone, University of California, was of the opinion that students are more willing to accept faculty ideas than the faculty are to accept student ideas. Students feel that they have much at stake and that they should be heard.

The term "student government" was repeatedly pointed to as a misnomer. Vice-President Knapp, Temple University, particularly emphasized this point. He said, "Let us get rid of the idea 'student government' and rather afford the student greater opportunity to participate in the government of the university."

Dean Joe A. Park, Ohio State University, elaborated the point when he said, "Isn't it our job to teach the student self-government." He quoted President Thompson of Cornell University, "It is not the student's job to govern the institution or the faculty. It is his job to learn how to govern himself." Joe Park insisted that our deans still faced the challenge of teaching their students self-government.

Dean Nowotny, University of Texas, made the telling observation that our aim should be to encourage university community government rather than student government. He pleaded for more student liaison committees, that might meet regularly with the dean of students, the president and the board of regents. Such problems as a change in fees, expansion of the student union, should never be handled arbitrarily by the administration; they should be resolved through consultation with student liaison committees that reflect the general student opinion. Quoting President Wilson, Dean Nowotny said, "The people must be enlightened. That is democracy." Dean Nowotny continued, "We must face the necessary fact of greater student participation."

Dean Roberts, University of Oklahoma, pleaded for ways and means of acquainting our students with all phases of university procedure even, as he put it, with "the inner workings of it. Let them know," he continued, "after all, we want them to mature."

Dean Williamson, University of Minnesota, seconded the

idea of seeking student opinion but cautioned against using a plebiscite. "If student opinion is carefully reflected it will allay suspicion," he believed.

Dean Neidlinger, Dartmouth College, urged an active cultivation of C. I. Barnard's concept of "the zone of indifference," and encouraged us all "to broaden the zone."

Labor-union forms of student government that tend to separate themselves in part or completely from the university were used as exhibit A of the lack of understanding between the student and the faculty. There was general agreement that the main cause of this misunderstanding was lack of communication.

This present lack of communication between our students and the faculty, between our students and the administration was stressed again and again throughout the meeting. It was the consensus of Group 5 that deans should exert every effort to explore ways of better communication in the student-faculty-administration area.

I am sure that the members of Group 5 give hearty and unanimous approval to Mr. Barnard's thesis that authority comes from the bottom up, not from the top down. They also hope with him for the speedy arrival of the day when truer and more accurate means of communication may be devised between men generally but between ourselves and our students in particular. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Just in case you think that all of those quotations made that much impression on Dean Walter, I want to give him away and say that this particular workshop was recorded on one of these machines, so that he could sit up there half an hour later and hear it all over again. [Laughter] And any of you who may want to hear it for a third time, can still go upstairs and give your name to Mr. Mahler and he will have one of these made so that you can take it home and listen to it as long as you want.

We are fifteen minutes ahead of our schedule. Therefore, if there is anybody who wants to make a short one and a half minute speech on student government, or to ask any questions of these men, let us spend the next few minutes at least in a discussion of these papers, or any aspect of student government that you want. Is there anyone who wants to rise with a question, or statement on the general field of student government? I am sure not everybody is either bashful, or else feels that this subject certainly has not been exhausted.

MR. THOMPSON: Gardner says he will make a speech if the

recorder is on.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: All right, the recorder is on. Don, go ahead. [Laughter]

MR. GARDNER: He wanted to make one, "Pudge." I didn't. [Laughter]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: No further interest in student government this morning?

SECRETARY TURNER: I would like to ask a question, if I may. I would like to ask Don, who after all was the briefer on this program, if he feels that the groups came anywhere near satisfying the specifications or answering the questions that he set up? Would he speak to that?

MR. DU SHANE: I was in one of the groups and I listened with some care to the reports of the other four, and I think considering what I gave to start with, you did pretty well.

If I were doing my job over again, I think I would do at least one thing that I did not. I would pay more attention to specific techniques of handling any problems through political devices. I would spend more time on such things as the one that was mentioned in our own discussion session, the fact that charges are made about absence of democracy when there is administrative interference or tyranny on student matters, and could point out as we did in that session that democratic governments provided legal redress for preventing wrongs to the majority by obstreperous minorities, and that when intolerable situations exist a grand jury technique has long been provided for in Anglo Saxon jurisprudence. I think that might have been a little more helpful in clarifying what is democracy and what it is not, because democracy is a very badly abused term, and I have had that feeling, as I say, this morning listening to the reports.

Democracy is not simply rule of the majority. Rule of the majority without any governmental techniques in connection with it is an almost intolerable concept of government in most human communities.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I don't believe anybody wants to argue with that, Don. Or is there? [Laughter]

Anything more, gentlemen, before we go on?

MR. CHAS. A. SEIDLE (Lehigh University): I have a commission from our circle of ODK that I have not been able to fulfill.

Are there any men's groups -- that is, co-educational school or men's colleges -- where there is an activities' point system in effect? I know some colleges had them before the war.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Those colleges that have a point system for limiting the activities of particular individuals, just raise their hands. [Raising of hands] There are a considerable number. If you want to get in touch with those fellows, spot them now, and you can talk about that point at lunch time.

Anything further? If not, we will proceed, a couple of minutes ahead of time, to the reports on the second workshop on "Administration of Student Personnel Programs." I think we will reverse the order this time and call first on Dean Biddle of the University of Pittsburgh, for the largest college group.

MR. T. W. BIDDLE (University of Pittsburgh): On the discussion of the administration of personnel problems in our group some thirty-six men, representing twenty-eight schools, considered the problem. We tried to discuss the problem as outlined by Blair Knapp.

We recognized communication as being an exceedingly serious problem today because our institutions have grown so large, so fast. It was indicated that most of the large institutions were already large to begin with, have multiplied their student body by two and three times, and when that growth has taken place so rapidly communication is an exceedingly difficult problem.

How to meet it? was discussed. It was felt that pamphlets for faculty, administration and student consumption, regarding the personnel program in effect at the institution, are effective devices.

It was found that many college bulletins do not provide a full statement of a personnel program and such, therefore, is considered essential and valuable.

Certain schools found that a movie on their institution, with full emphasis on the personnel program, is a fine device, used effectively with students before they reach the institution and with faculty and students after their arrival.

The value of communications in effective personnel work is emphasized, it was pointed out, in positions, in instances of emergency, and in reaching what one dean called "the lost battalion," and it was felt that this large group within our total group is a group that can be best met by student leadership.

As for meeting some of the communication problems with faculty and staff, it was suggested that a personnel council, as indicated by Blair Knapp, is a fine device for, thereby, the faculty are brought into the formulation of policies and they are cooperative in it.

Meetings of new faculty members each year is considered an important device because they must be brought face to face with the administrative character of the institution and the facilities provided faculty and students.

One dean suggested that all involved in personnel work meet each morning for breakfast - coffee, about eight-thirty, while another dean questioned how the physiological habits of man could be so interrupted. [Laughter]

On the matter of coordination it was felt that this squarely is the problem of administration and that we, as the personnel officers, have this problem more than anyone else.

It was felt that coordination with faculty is a sore point -- I am speaking of coordination with teaching faculty -- and in this respect there is doubtless a direct correlation with our success at communication in the first instance.

Coordination with student leaders is important, it was felt, because through student leadership we can reach this group of other students, this "lost battalion" as indicated, which so often is untouched.

It was pointed out that effective coordination with our householders, those who rent rooms to our students, is an effective device in reaching this fringe group. Telling our story to parents is an important device too in reaching that fringe group of students who live at home.

We spent some time talking about the lack of coordination with the athletic staff. It was expressed that we have effective coordination with the groups within our own departments, but the athletic department, being somewhat at arms length from a personnel officer, is an important group that has not been as effectively touched as others. Some devices whereby this group can be touched were suggested and those include the personnel officers extending their interest into that field. We have to go them, it is felt, because they normally do not come to us.

It was suggested that we make a point of going to athletic drills, to visit the dressing room, to take trips with

the athletic teams. It was felt that the athletes, when living in dormitories in our normal fashion, can be effectively reached by our dormitory counselors. It was thought advisable by some men that we seek a former athlete as membership on our staffs.

The matter of recruiting manpower seemed quite important to this group because, as I indicated before, we have grown too fast, too large too fast. It was felt that graduate students in our graduate schools are a resource of personnel that has not been sufficiently touched. It was felt also that we have on our own staff people not in personnel positions who could assume personnel responsibilities in a modest way, could take graduate training in the field, and be effective people.

It was indicated that faculty members grow weary in well-doing as advisors to student organizations and that we, as administrators, would be smart to run them in shifts so to speak so that they can have their turn of duty, have a relief, and come back with stronger enthusiasm.

We cried on each other's shoulders a bit, stating that unfortunately faculty members are not willing to make sufficient contributions in the personnel area; that is, serving as student counselors, serving as organization advisors, because they see this work as hindering their professional advancement. They see no dollar credit, or credit-hour credit, for work in the field. So we feel a responsibility to persuade other university administration that this work is important.

It was pointed out that with tightening budgets we may not be able to secure all the financial resources that are essential to a good program.

It was suggested that if we accept the broad definition of education, such as to develop people into well-adjusted, socially productive members of the community, then we can speak with more enthusiasm and authority in asking for money and assistance in developing a thorough program. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Group 4 is those colleges with 5,000 to 10,000 students. The report will be given by Dean Penberthy of Texas A. & M. College.

MR. W. L. PENBERTHY (Ag. & Mech. College of Texas): Gentlemen, we had 41 members in our group, and we got around to discussing two of the problems that were posed by our counselor Blair Knapp, the first being communication and the second coordination. There we stopped as our time ran out.

I am going to try to be specific in the things that we suggested and especially in regard to techniques and things that these other institutions, or the institutions in our group, were using. I am going to call names with the idea in mind that if you care to see that particular dean and go into it with him a little further in regard to some of the techniques that you may do so.

So here we go on communications.

At Chicago, Bob Strozier reported that they found that a student-faculty relations committee for the whole school, equal representation, five each, helped a lot, and they extended that into the various schools of the college and it seemed to help a lot.

Tate of SMU confessed that his setup, being new, they had not done as good a job as might have been done or he would have liked to have done, which could be said of all of us I am sure, but now that budget-cutting time has come around, he fears that maybe they won't know what kind of a program he is trying to sell because of the fact that they don't know. The people of the community and the college don't know exactly, and haven't been advised of what the program is. Again I say I think we are all pretty guilty of that.

McBride of Florida State has occasional dinners with his student monitors as a way of communicating the policies of the institution.

Deakins, Illinois Institute of Technology, says they have a deans' coffee hour once a week, at which time they bring the faculty and the students together. His president also meets with a small selected group there, in discussing institutional policies that seem to work pretty well.

At Oregon, Don DuShane reported that the getting of the students together with the president is very effective, especially in confirmation of a lot of things that he has been reporting to the president on feelings of the students with regard to certain policies, and that seems to be working.

Miner of Miami of Ohio meets with individual faculties and explains their setup, asks questions, offers and suggests ways in which the dean of students setup can be of service to that particular school. Also they use the faculty newspaper published once a week at Miami, and then they get the president to meet with students whenever necessary for informal discussions.

At Tennessee, Dunford has a Pledge Relations Board, where

fraternity pledges and representative fraternity pledges and representatives of other groups on the campus meet and talk over situations with the idea that those men are going to be future student leaders of the institution. The use of bulletin boards was also mentioned and the use of many telephones. Of course the student newspaper was just more or less taken for granted.

Stewart at Wayne University, uses mail boxes where different student groups can buy and pick up different information that is felt desirable to communicate to the students. Copies of this information are also sent to members of the faculty and any faculty advisors that might be on the staff.

DeMarino at Pennsylvania State College uses a conference room adjacent to his office, which he keeps staffed every day from ten to five for anyone who wants to come by and talk over any of the situations and seek any information that he might want to have.

Hendrix at Alabama uses the radio, a station downtown, on more or less one of these disc programs, and they can put out a lot of good information that way. He also had a very novel plan too of a speaker's bureau where they had about twenty men who were briefed and given information in regard to university policies, and then those men went out and talked to different student groups, fraternities, clubs and so forth. That seemed to be effective.

Those were the special techniques that were used by these whose names and institutions I have mentioned.

On coordination, Willis Tate at SMU tried something recently in having all of the non-academic people on his campus meet at one place and they were given a talk by a visitor on their campus as to their function, as to their responsibility, in an attempt to interpret the warmth of the institution and the attitude to visitors to the institution and to their own constituents. That sounds like an awfully good deal to a lot of us.

We went on, on that, to the point where some schools have important functions of the dean of students office not handled by the dean of students but by some other agency. For instance, Bob Strozier at Chicago stated that when he came into his work that the business office was handling housing, which is a very important function of a dean of students' office. So the question came up, how do you get those functions under the centralized program, without stepping on people's toes, and without having everybody think you wanted to be a monarch, and so Bates of VPI comes up with the idea that in his case he referred everything that came up, right back to the office that happened to handle, or the agency that happened to handle the particular thing that should

be in the centralized program of the dean of students. He found that the other agency got kind of sick of it after a while and they were glad to have somebody take it off their hands.

The old question came up of the administrative relationship between the deans of men and the deans of women. It was brought out by Miner of Oxford and Tate of Georgia, that they had had experiences in which deans of women reported that they were either going to be liquidated or ostracized by their particular associations if they were not given full status with the dean of men. But it seems that at Cornell Baldwin and his co-worker there, with the women, have a very fine working relationship, and so, gentlemen, he must have something the rest of us don't have. [Laughter] I say that in all compliment. Of course, we don't have any women at all at Texas A. & M., so I can stand up here and pop off. [Laughter]

I think it was pretty well decided in our group that women want equal status with men and I feel, and I hope I am interpreting the consensus of the group, that it doesn't make so very much difference, maybe now, who the woman reports to as long as she reports to the same one that the man reports to, on an equal basis; but I think if she had her "druthers" it would rather be to the president.

We took a few polls and here they are, and with this, gentlemen, I end. On this poll seven institutions, the dean of men and dean of women reported to the president on the same level. In eleven institutions in our group they reported through a coordinator to the president. In eighteen institutions in our group there were centralized programs with an administrator.

On the poll on administrators with teaching responsibilities, there were twelve. In those who did not, but who would like to do some teaching along with their administration, there were thirteen. In two institutions the administrator, the dean of students, was responsible for the food services of the institution. In two institutions where a student was living in a college operated dormitory, he was required to eat in the food service provided by the institution. In fifteen institutions the student union program was in the centralized program administered by the dean of students. Of those that had them, six institutions reported that they did not.

I would like to take this one moment to express my appreciation for our recorder, Stibbs of Tulane, and our three experts Bob Strozier of Chicago, Willis Tate of SMU and Foster Alter of Miami.

Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Now the middle sized colleges, John Quinn, Rhode Island State College, for Group 3.

MR. JOHN F. QUINN (Rhode Island State College): Mr. Chairman, gentlemen: There were 42 men attended our session yesterday. We followed the outline at your lefthand on the black-board in front of the room, in every respect except for the last point on the sociological ramifications of campus life. We did not cover that point because of lack of time.

The recorder, Doug. Miner of Carnegie Tech, has turned in this admirable report, quote, and the first six or seven words tell the whole story:

"Deans need to take more responsibility for further development of these four fields: communication, coordination, and so forth."

There were no earth-shattering revelations, no universal agreements, nothing solved, nothing settled; but thanks to the good offices of the experts, Don Gardner and Wray Congdon, some profitable discussions to take back home were had -- we hope.

That is it. [Laughter and applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I attended that particular session. It wasn't quite that secret. [Laughter]

For Group 2, Dean Gerber of Northwestern College.

MR. JOE N. GERBER (Northwestern State College): Our group consisted of 45 deans in the group of colleges having 1,000 to 2,000 students. We roamed rather freely back and forth across the topic, being strictly on course perhaps only when we crossed it.

Dean Knapp did a particularly excellent job for us in saving time by defining the problem. We did not cover all of the problems for lack of time. We did commence our discussion with the problem of communication. We felt that though communication is a problem for our size college, it certainly is not the critical problem that it is for the large universities.

We divided the problem of communication into two general groups, the off-campus problem and the on-campus problem. The major problem which evolved with respect to communication off campus was with respect to communication with parents. Our group felt

that we are missing the boat considerably by not orienting the parents and keeping them properly informed, that many of the parents don't realize the degree of freedom the students have in college, so immediately, that they did not have at home, that we don't actually tuck them in bed and watch after every move, as has been true in their lives up until that point. There were a number of suggestions about techniques to solve that -- Dad's Day, Parents' Day, using every occasion possible to write letters to the parents, those being the principle techniques.

On the campus, we recommend something of the same nature Dean Knapp recommended yesterday, that of a representative group of students and faculty members. That has been tried, incidentally, by one member of our group and failed. He felt that the failure was due pretty largely to lack of understanding leadership, and had he that same thing to do over he felt it might be very successful.

We felt that there had better be more use of student newspaper for communicating ideas and information, urging even that the students be led to seek out information, publish it, make it known, through their own channels. We recommend also more widespread use of assemblies, with the agenda announced, as a good technique.

As a factor in communication, we talked some about teaching part time in connection with our duties. Approximately two thirds of our group felt that personnel administrators should teach, and about half of those who thought they should actually do. We felt, however, that teaching would give us an entrée that we did not quite have as pure administrators.

Now there is one in every crowd, and we had our representative from the devil. He was self-styled and he championed the virtues of silence. He wondered if our attempts at communication had not led us into the very problem that we have. Communication calls for more communication. We start with a small bulletin board, for example, with important notices. Then we get a call for more postings, so we increase the size of the bulletin boards. The number of bulletins increases and finally nobody reads any of them.

We did agree with him, I think, on several points. Perhaps we have an over-organization on our campuses which blocks effective communication. That is, the number of student organizations has increased to the point where our student bodies are split in so many ways that it is difficult to get accurate information to all of them. In that connection we recommended a streamlining of organizations as far as is possible and practicable, and a simplification as much as is possible in the lines of communication.

We rather combined manpower and coordination of services. We were running out of time mighty fast. Perhaps one of the most popular techniques, or promising techniques offered in that line was the use of carefully selected student proctors in dormitories.

The most striking and unique example we had was of the system developing at Antioch, wherein the Department of Psychology and the officers and student personnel combine their work and offer credit for work done as proctors, by proctors. Some of you I think may want to question Dean Hollister a little further for the details of that program.

The use of faculty advisors in counseling -- we went through the same old story on that, and we come up only with the reminder of two strong objections to faculty advisors and counselors. One is that faculty members already have a profession. They have a teaching field which they chose. We doubt that it is wise or fair to ask them to become proficient in a second profession. The second objection is that whenever we have faculty advisors we have a certain amount of ax-grinding, pulling students into our department as majors.

We recommend of course, as stated earlier, a personnel advisory group, similar to those mentioned.

The only other point I would like to make is entirely on the side, but you may be interested in it. A final poll indicated that for our type of colleges, among those represented, about two and one-half full time student personnel workers is the average per thousand men students.

Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: The small college group, Dean Espenshade of Elizabethtown College.

MR. EBY C. ESPENSHADE (Elizabethtown College): Mr. President, gentlemen: Phil Price of Rochester was the recorder and shares the responsibility for this report with me. I imagine that a lot of what has been said this morning, and which will be said this afternoon, can be summed up in a remark I heard last night in passing. Two gentlemen were talking. They said it reminded them of two churches right across the street from each other. One church had for its theme, "There ain't no hell," and the other one said, "The hell there ain't." [Laughter]

On communications, Blair Knapp said we are to give you techniques rather than generalities. On techniques for communications the following were suggested as being used: Dormitory

council committees; an all college conference where the student council is a member as a sub-committee. One college has compulsory chappel but twice a month. This is omitted and at that time the students talk with their advisors or with members of the faculty. Another idea was a family convocation in which the president of the institution answered questions for the student body from questions which were submitted to him previously, such as budget, endowment, housing, etc. Another method was an informal faculty luncheon. Some schools mentioned that this was on a voluntary basis but most of the faculty attended and paid their own way.

I think we were almost in the majority -- most of us agreed that a student leadership retreat in the fall of the year is a good thing.

Under coordination, I think you will be interested to know that at least two of the schools in our group reported that the superintendent of buildings and grounds was also a deputy sheriff. [Laughter] Under coordination too it was felt that a lot could be done if some members of the faculty were alumni of the school.

We probably spent more time than some other groups on the last one, regarding techniques in training our young people. We don't have the advantages, in small schools, of taking a graduate student, but the following techniques were suggested as to what we can do to train our people in service. One suggestion was a two-day conference prior to the beginning of school, the first day of which was used to acquaint new faculty with the school, the second day all faculty members were present. More consideration was given I think, not necessarily to acquaint new faculty or new people in techniques, but to what we can do to perk up the old ones who have gotten in a rut. Two things were suggested here. One was to find the weak sisters and give them more responsibility; and secondly, when you get back home, try to talk your president into allowing the business manager or the professor of philosophy to accompany you to NADAM next year.

Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I think I will take the personal responsibility of vetoing that last suggestion. If we had 190 people, as we had this time, plus somebody else from each college, I don't know where we would be.

Now, Blair, will you come up here and give your comments now on what these fellows have done?

MR. KNAPP: Why don't I do it right here?

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: All right.

MR. KNAPP: I think they have done a swell job. My only hope, in the introductory analysis, was to try to get specific, and as near as I can understand it, the groups did that. The great danger in a field as broad as administration is that we talk in generalities all the time.

Just one concluding statement. I knew perfectly well you weren't going to get at that fifth point because I knew you were not going to have time, and in the second place I was sure there isn't anybody in this room, including myself, who knows anything about it. I did it deliberately however because I have a deep conviction that with the shrinking budgets and with the problem of manpower, and so forth, we are going to be forced to do more things with groups of students instead of with individuals. We are going to be forced to do some of our counseling with groups instead of with individuals.

We are experimenting a little with vocational counseling in groups, and finding very interesting possibilities. I feel very deeply that some of us, somehow, have got to get some help in understanding group technique in a fashion in which we have been led to understand a little better the techniques of personal counsel. It is going to be a discouraging venture, because our sociologists and our social psychologists, to whom I have attempted to talk about this thing, just are not interested, and we must somehow push them off that point of where they are looking over the college community to the outside world. I do hope we will keep that point in mind, because I think we are going to desperately need it in the years to come. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Thank you very much.

I think I will take this minute just to repeat something which I told the group with which I met, about a brand new discovery that I made in my own institution only a month ago.

It happens that in one of our psychology courses we spend a couple of weeks' time on public opinion polls -- techniques of doing it -- and all students in the classes, working in groups, have to actually conduct a poll of opinion on some subject. This year a new instructor there hit on the happy idea of having them deal with local student gripes and problems, and he put on my desk only a couple of weeks ago a stack of reports which had been made in a real professional manner, by professionally selected samples of students and so forth, which has given me a real poll of student

thinking on a number of problems on our campus. That is a thing that can be done annually in that course, and as far as he was concerned his experience proved that it was a much more interesting project for students than to send them out in the community, in the countryside, to find out which kind of toothpaste people didn't like, and why. I would suppose that most of your institutions have some course, either in your business school or in your psychology department, where they do that sort of thing. I am very happy to have made that discovery of a way in which I can get a scientific sampling of student opinion, done on a purely objective basis by a group that has no particular ax to grind.

Does someone else have some other item to discuss which they want to comment on regarding this problem of student personnel organization?

MR. CARL W. KNOX (University of Illinois): I am wondering if there are any representatives here who could mention a few specific techniques of including graduate students in the line of communication, and as to the services offered by your central personnel program?

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Is there anyone here who definitely includes graduate student groups in the student setup or other parts of your personnel program?

MR. QUINN: We use graduate students only for dormitory sponsors. We don't use them as proctors. In each dormitory for 200 men, we now have three, a house mother and six graduate student sponsors in each dormitory. The graduate students in education do some routine work in connection with my office, personnel administration. Those are two areas where we use them.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I am sure that that is a common thing, to use graduate students in those capacities, and also to a certain extent in administrative offices.

I take it what you are interested in, Carl, is whether the graduate schools were organized for student activities?

MR. KNOX: Without orientation, and without special activities lined up for them, how were they brought into line of communication and in line with the services offered by your personnel program?

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Can anyone offer a suggestion?

MR. R. S. WALDROP (Vanderbilt University): We have on our student union board a representative of each of the graduate

or professional schools. That board is constituted to allocate the funds collected for student activities.

Also on our student council we have a representative from each of our graduate and professional schools.

So they have a part in the student government, regarding student activities.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Thank you, sir.

Let me ask a question on that then. Is Dean Walter of Michigan here? I know his situation. He left. Is Bud Rea here? I just happened to know, there is a situation in which there is a graduate school of law in which they are living in special dormitory groups, and so forth, and I was going to ask him how they tied that into their picture.

SECRETARY TURNER: I can't speak for Michigan, but I can speak for Illinois, and I think we may have a problem that is going to face a good many of us who have graduate schools.

Up until this year, we have specifically and by regulations excluded graduate schools from participation in student activities, except once in a while in dramatics or something like that where no undergraduate could fill the particular spot and a graduate student was used. I believe it is within the past week, isn't it, Ed, that we amended our regulations so that individual activities may begin to use graduate students in their program, and that has come about for two reasons. First, is the fact that our graduate school has more than doubled in size and a good many of the students themselves have been asking for a chance to participate; and the activities themselves have had the feeling that they would gain quite a little by letting graduate students into it; and there is still a third but rather important factor, and that is the fact that the present dean of the graduate school is interested in the program whereas the previous dean had no interest whatever in graduate students participating in any activities.

I believe participation of graduate students in activities may be facing some of us who haven't had it before. Maybe on other campuses graduate students have always been in everything, but we have, prior to the past week, excluded them by regulation from participating in student affairs.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I trust that Dean Turner is not going to extend that to athletic participation. I don't know who he has that is graduating this year that they need next fall, but you fellows better keep your eye on the extension of that policy.

If there is no further discussion on this, I want to pull a dirty trick on two or three men in the audience and get at least a sampling of what happened at some of these luncheon meetings. These men are unprepared and unrehearsed and I trust they won't be uncooperative, but I would like to ask Joe Park if he would come up and just tell us briefly what happened in the Fraternity Policies luncheon table, whether you got any place or not. Is Joe in the room? He certainly had no reason to anticipate this before he left!

Next is Dean Haugen of the University of Vermont, and I will ask him if they got any place on Publications.

Don't tell me he has left too. I made a good selection here! All right, I still have a third victim, and I would like to get Assistant Dean Faunce of Michigan State College to come up and tell us whether they got any place on Cheating. Dean Faunce is also absent. [Laughter]

Mr. Secretary, will you please remind me to give those men a failing grade in this course? [Laughter]

We still have a lot that we can do here, and I am going to skip around a little more. Is Dean Burts of Mercer University here? Will you come up and tell us whether you got any place on the Fraternity Rushing idea? -- and the rest of you who had luncheon tables better begin to get prepared.

MR. RICHARD C. BURTS (Mercer University): I said to "Pudge" that I left my notes in my room. I hadn't expected to be called upon and I will have to do as the colored preacher did. A lady in the congregation said she didn't like this new preacher, he preached out of his notes right extensively. She liked the old preacher because he just talked "but of his head," and you may recognize that. [Laughter]

The first question we raised concerned deferred rushing plans, and there was the usual split in the thinking of the group on the advisability as a strain on the fraternity men in the deferred plan. I think only two of the thirteen gathered at the table operated under a deferred plan. Dean Bostwick at Allegheny College is planning to install it next year. One other institution operates under a deferred plan. Mercer did last year, but it was abandoned by the inter-fraternity council because of the strain on the boys who were doing the rushing, because there really was not a deferred rushing plan. It was an extended rushing plan, extended through the whole of the first term.

By and large, the decisions on rushing plans were made by inter-fraternity councils rather than by the administrative men represented at our table, and in their institutions, a rather undergraduate control group.

By and large, there is no financial restriction placed on rushing plans. There are certain restrictions as to types of activity. There was general agreement that there is a tighter restriction concerning liquor on rushing parties, than is generally true of institutional policy. For instance, an institution which has no strict liquor regulations, during the rushing period the fraternities themselves assume a rather strict attitude.

One of the things mentioned as a very desirable technique was that every freshman who is being rushed is invited, and in some instances required, to attend an open house at every fraternity place. That is, he must have his eyes open to what the other groups are, what they represent, before he can pledge any specific group. One of the handicaps with that was that in places where we have 28 or 30 fraternities it is rather cumbersome and rather impossible to get every man to every place. But you can recognize that, with our ability of having that widespread view to be taken by the man who is being rushed.

I would like to call upon others who were at the table to refresh me at this point on things that we said and did which were important, which I have not been able to recall off the cuff.

The length of the rushing period was pretty well divided. I think the shortest length of period was three days. One group had a rushing period of Thursday, Friday and Saturday, I think, over a weekend. I think there were two that had rushing periods for four days, something like another two or three that had rushing periods for approximately a week, and others who had a rushing period extending up to two weeks. The rushing periods, in calendar, took place from the ranges of before school opened -- the rushing is done actually prior to the registration and orientation process. The freshmen men are invited to the campus for the rushing period. We didn't get to the point of whether any men came to the campus for rushing and were not rushed. But that was one extreme.

Quite generally they take place within the first few days of the opening of school, during the orientation period, quite characteristically, up until the mid-term period. The mid-semester period, I think, was the latest one which we had reported.

Are there other points which our table members would care to refresh us on?

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Thank you very much. At least we get a sampling of what happened, and I am quite interested to get any comments, and I am sure other members of the executive committee are, on whether or not the technique of trying to get some of our problems discussed at the luncheon table worked out. I think the physical arrangements perhaps could be improved in another year. I have already heard that the long tables made it a little difficult for men at one end to discuss with the other.

I want now to ask Mr. Camp, who is my assistant at Dartmouth and who has been trying to manage the recording of the dictators, so-called, if he can just give us a few comments on how that has appeared to work out.

MR. CHARLES F. CAMP (Dartmouth College): First I would like to thank a good many of you gentlemen who came up and went through the process of recording talks on these various subjects, 1 to 7, that you have seen in your program.

There has been quite a lot of interest, particularly in deferred rushing and relations with parents. They are probably the top ones.

Incidentally, that number VII, Thefts and Forgeries, is excellent, probably one of the most interesting of the group.

"Pudge" and Fred Turner worked this thing out and didn't know quite how it would go over. I think there has been a very good response and they can feel very well about having started this thing this time. As I understand, it has not been done before. We are also much indebted to the Lafayette radio man who brought this equipment here.

If you people want copies of these -- and some have already indicated that they do -- we would like to have you sign up for it in Room B. At Dartmouth we will attempt to get these things out. It would seem that the best bet would be to record these on long playing discs, however, if you just want one or two then we have the problem which we haven't decided finally as to how we will do it. We might put it on a short record. However I think that a short record takes only four and a half minutes and most of these will go six to eight minutes. We will try to work that out, and if you want copies of these records and will leave your name and address, we will ship them to you as soon as we can get the things done, and charge you the cost that we incur in doing it.

Any comments that you have on this thing, we will appreciate hearing, and it may have some bearing on whether it will

be attempted again at another session.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: The individual speeches run four or five minutes each. The record on any one of the subjects -- which would include a minimum of five speeches, and most of them have six -- would run approximately half an hour. We can, I am sure, just take off the comments of individual men, if that is what you want, but I think the most useful thing for most of you will be to have the records complete so you can bring the comments of five or six different deans on the subject to attention.

John Hocutt, you have some announcements, I am sure.

... Announcements ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: When we get through here you will have just about time to get yourselves over to get your picture taken, and we are anxious of course to have everybody in that picture.

May I remind the members of my Executive Committee that we are to meet at luncheon today. We are to meet with Mr. Blaesser of the Office of Education.

SECRETARY TURNER: Is "Shorty" Nowotny in the room? "Shorty" isn't here. He asked me to announce, if he weren't here, that any men who are here who are faculty advisors to Alpha Phi Omega to get together after the main photograph. He wants to get a group photograph of that particular bunch. So if you are a faculty advisor of Alpha Phi Omega, hunt "Shorty" up after the main photograph is taken.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We will adjourn, and go immediately to the photographic stands.

... The convention recessed at ten-fifty o'clock ...

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

March 17, 1950

The convention reconvened at one-forty o'clock, President Neidlinger presiding.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Can we get those men out of those comfortable seats back there and up here, so we don't look quite so hollow? We are presuming that if we get started some of those people waiting upstairs for silence to descend down here will come down. I trust at least all our principals for this afternoon's session are here because they have had some warning of it.

We will hear the reports from the group discussions, first on Workshop No. 3 in "Counseling," and the first man to report will be Dean Tate of Hanover College, on the small college group.

MR. E. M. TATE (Hanover College): Those of you who have personal friends among the deans of small colleges know that most of us are trying to do the work of several men, so when it comes to a discussion on almost anything, we are likely to by-pass the philosophical side of it and get down to what we consider the more practical ways of making our time and efforts go further and getting more done. So this particular group did just that, and settled for three things in a little more than an hour's time that we had.

The first one was a consideration for a little while of practical values of group counseling. I am not sure that we got very far with that, except we heard with some interest the report from Mr. Warren Bruner of Defiance College, who is experimenting with a 6-credit year course in what he calls "career determination," in which he works with a voluntary group of freshmen and attempts in that time to do a whole lot of things that some of the rest of us do in brief orientation lectures, plus a great deal besides that.

The principal interest of the group I think was on the use and training of students as counselors. I regret personally that I missed a lot of this luncheon conference that was held here today, because it covered more of the same ground on which we worked in our discussion period. Most of the small colleges use students as counselors in freshmen orientation, but there was no enthusiasm for a suggestion that someone made that the students ought to give academic advice, officially, to freshmen entering. We decided there was enough of it given unofficially, without going farther in that direction.

We were very much interested in the example of Principia, which is a resident college, with well organized social groups. There are men in each of these social houses who are responsible for various academic and social duties. They are trained by the dean, through a series of meetings that are held from time to time, and the whole organization seems to be very closely knit.

We discovered that the practice of having dormitory counselors from upper classmen, among upper classmen was growing. There is a tendency, which was emphasized a good deal in our group, that these men should not be proctors, that they should have no police duties or duties of reporting to the dean of rules and regulations that had been broken. Rather, the aim seems to be preventative. They are truly counselors in the sense that when they see students doing that which seems to be against the best interests of the whole, they are spoken to, but not necessarily reported.

The problem of working these counselors in with elected members of a dormitory council was solved in one place by having the official counselors elected. This was at Hiram, I believe. Hiram prefers Juniors to apply for such a position. They are then recommended by the dean, but actually elected in the spring by the members of the dormitory in which they live. Thus, they avoid in another way a semblance of being the stooges of the dean, because they are chosen by their own people. Other institutions which seem to be working along this line were Alfred University and Washington & Lee, to mention only two that came out in the discussion.

We found that many institutions also insisted on having a head resident who would be either a staff member, sometimes a member of the faculty, in addition to these student counselors. It seems to me to be a very far cry, but in the right direction, from the olden days when a dormitory was simply a collection of men living together with practically no control of any kind.

The group felt that the definition of responsibility of student counselors was very important, that they must know what was expected of them, and that those whom they are to counsel must also know very carefully what to expect from those who are helping them.

The whole thing must be a constant educational practice, and several schools reported weekly or twice-monthly meetings with these counselors and the dean, discussing events that came up-- again, not from the point of view of disciplinary action, but how to bring about the best spirit and to prevent what might be possible outbreaks against regulations.

The third matter discussed had to be closed off very shortly, but it concerned the use of faculty members as counselors. In most small colleges all the faculty have some responsibility as advisors or counselors. That system, however, was deplored by most of the deans present on the ground that there are always some faculty who are not capable of giving counsel in the right direction. Therefore, they took the stand that it was better to select, wherever possible, the best men and women of the faculty and to train that group to be good counselors of the incoming students until such period as those students may go on to the major department.

The dean's office will have to take the largest responsibility for this. Some of it may be handled through admissions; some of it may be handled through other ways, but if the dean is interested in getting the best counseling done, it will be his responsibility to see that the faculty members have the authority which is necessary for the carrying on of their work.

I think the group felt that on the whole, in small colleges, the faculty advisory programs were in a rather bad shape, that there is need in that area for a tremendous amount of study and the exchange of ideas. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Group 2, the report to be given by Bob Bates of Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

MR. ROBERT E. BATES (Virginia Polytechnic Institute): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: I enjoyed meeting with the representatives of institutions from 1,000 to 5,000 yesterday, considering some of their problems in connection with counseling that are and can be met in ways somewhat different from those institutions that I am a little more closely associated with.

Most of the time of our discussions centered around the organization which was maintained in the institutions for counseling purposes. It is the general practice of these institutions to use a large part of the faculties as counselors for students.

It is no surprise to the folks who knew Jim Findlay, when he was active in the organization, to find that Drury College has gone farther perhaps than any other institution represented in building the basic college policies around counseling. Dean Clippinger gave us a rather extensive outline of that plan in which the entire faculty is assigned up to fifteen freshmen, or sophomores, for counseling. They have done away with a lot of the specific requirements, academic requirements, and have replaced it with counselors and they count on them to see that the students get a

point of view which leads them to select the type of thing that is usually specified in more or less rigorous form by academic course requirements.

They attempt to contact their students once every two weeks. It doesn't quite work out that way, but they do feel that they make good progress in keeping in touch with the students on the campus.

One thing which is of interest in this setup is that counseling which a faculty member does is given real consideration in his advancement, which of course provides an incentive to that work. New members brought on to the staff are also selected in part on the basis of their suitability for counseling, as well as their suitability for academic teaching.

Students may change their advisors any time they like, and the advisors may request that students be changed if they do not feel that they are getting results. They emphasize in the first year their general adjustment to college; the second year there is more emphasis on their vocational choice; then in the last two years they are passed on to the department heads for training or counseling in their major fields.

With few exceptions in the institutions represented, not only the general counseling but the academic advising, which is generally done by the same people, is coordinated by the dean of men or dean of students, which I think is less common in the larger institutions.

There was no satisfactory answer to the one question raised as to how the staff members should be paid for their time given to counseling when it was impossible to reduce their load or to give them financial remuneration. Probably the practice of Drury in giving real consideration to their effectiveness as counselors in their promotions would do as much for that as any other suggestion that was made.

The question as to means of selecting courses -- a few institutions are handicapped because they operate on a plan whereby the students select their courses before they come to the campus, and therefore they do not have an opportunity for counseling, at least at the beginning when the representatives here of those schools felt that that would be highly desirable. The question was raised as to whether the student contacts were less frequent or less effective in schools that use the IBM equipment, and I think it was generally felt that that equipment served the purpose of simplifying the clerical aspects of registration and so on, but did not necessarily decrease the amount of personal contact which

the counselors had with the students. In some cases there was a feeling that because of the simplification of the clerical end of the job, that it really increased the opportunity which the counselors had to help the students, by eliminating the paper work.

There was caution regarding the use of test results by faculty advisors when the faculty advisors were selected at large from the staff because there was considerable danger that these persons were not qualified to use that information, and that had caused headaches in some cases.

There was one question raised as to possible means of evaluating counseling. The suggestion came out that might be of some benefit, to have students who had gone through the counseling process make an evaluation, during their upper class years when they were no longer counseled as a part of the more intensive program that most schools have for the freshmen and sophomores. Dean Marshall of East Carolina Teachers College outlined a two-quarter course which they have instituted and require of all freshmen as an orientation course, including such things as how to study, the use of the library, general manners, etiquette, and a wide range of things which are of use to students though not usually considered as part of a college program. This course, taught in units of thirty students, had proved quite effective in their institution and the opinion was expressed that while that might be stretching the idea of counseling somewhat that such a course would perhaps eliminate some considerable number of counseling problems before they arise. Perhaps that is one answer to the suggestion Blair Knapp gave us this morning, that we may have to go to some group counseling methods, rather than depend entirely on the personal approach.

Dean Marshall indicated that he would be glad to pass on information concerning that course to some of the rest of you, and from what he gave us, I am sure that you will get something worthwhile from it.

Then the question was raised, suggested by Bill Blaesser's comment, as to whether the counselors really want the students to make up their own minds, or whether they want to make up the minds for the students in expressing their own opinions, and there was a feeling that in most institutions represented there was some combination of counseling in a more technical sense and administrative direction in connection with the requirements of the college, and things of that kind, so that we could not draw a fine line between the two objectives of technical counseling, helping the student make up his own mind on questions, but that it was necessary for the counselors frequently to step in and push things a little faster than that.

I want to acknowledge the work of the recorder, Dean Marshall, and of our experts, Dean Trusler of Kansas State Teachers College at Emporia, and Dean Clippinger of Drury College, and Dean Bostwick of Allegheny, who was called in as a pinch-hitter for Jarchow, who was nursing a bug upstairs and as a result he is able to be with us today, whereas had he been paddling around in the snow, I am afraid he might not have been.

Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Group 3, the middle size college group, Dean Will Hayes of Santa Barbara College.

MR. L. GRAY BURDIN (Butler University): As recorder for the group, I have been asked to speak for Dean Hayes.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We will be glad to have Mr. Burdin, who is recorder for the group, speak.

MR. BURDIN: Dean Hayes asked that I express his regret at his inability to be here. He has flown back to California and apparently is on his way now.

My first impression of the workshop dealing with counseling for our size colleges reminds me somewhat of the description given by Washington Irving of the Headless Horseman who mounted his steed and galloped off in all directions; but eventually the issues settled down to some fairly clear directions.

The first direction was the problem itself. There were some definitions given for counseling which I think might be wise to discuss with you now. First, Dean Hayes suggested that counseling might be the giving of advice to students and letting them talk about matters of concern to them. Dean Shumway felt that counseling was the giving of advice and letting students do most of the talking. Dean Hunkins felt that good counseling constituted talking over a problem and arriving at a course of action with the students.

The general nature of the discussion itself then turned to the causes necessitating counseling, and it was felt that there were three causes that give rise to the counseling necessity. The first cause is that of indifference on the part of the student, that indifference ultimately getting the student in some kind of difficulty. Secondly, bad advice. Many times bad advice is occasioned by others on the campus giving advice. I recall one gentleman present who said that even the janitors who many times counsel students sometimes counsel them the wrong way. The third

cause of these difficulties is really the troubles that keep popping up in the lives of these students.

As to possible solutions for these various causes, there were several proposed. First, it was proposed that we try to reach the indifferent students, and immediately the discussion turned as to how we can reach the indifferent student. No clear-cut answer was given there, gentlemen, except the following suggestions. (1) Perhaps we can reach the indifferent student by attempting to find what motivates that student. (2) It was suggested that we might reach the indifferent student by looking over the record. The second general cause of the counseling necessity was found that it might be possible to contact these students through terminal counseling. In other words, we try to undo at the end what has already been done through the life of the student.

At that juncture a question was asked from the floor as to the number of deans present who engaged in terminal counseling and virtually every dean present raised his hand. It seems to be a widespread activity on the part of deans.

The fourth cause of the counseling necessity was said to be the attitude of a lack of self-responsibility. I recall that one dean was rather vigorous in his presentation of the developing of self-responsibility among college students, saying that in his particular college that the bills were mailed directly to the student and the grades were mailed directly to the student in lieu of the parents receiving the grades, as is probably the case in many colleges here represented.

As to the possible solutions for these difficulties and causes, this was the consensus of opinion as I got it. It was felt, first, that some effort should be made during the testing program to analyze carefully the entrance examinations of all students to determine the areas of potential difficulty that might be occurring. Secondly, it was suggested that the dean make certain that his door is open at all times, and that full arrangements be made for a program of conference with any or all men.

That, Mr. Chairman, constitutes the report of this workshop. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Thank you very much Dean Burdin. I compliment you on the job. I attended that session myself, and it wasn't quite as clear to me as you made it appear, [Laughter] which shows a good recorder.

The next group is Group 4, and Dean Woodruff of the

University of Kansas will report.

MR. L. E. WOODRUFF (University of Kansas): Our recorder was Dean Manchester of Kent State. This not being the day for a Saturday letter, he refuses to accept any joint responsibility for this report. [Laughter]

In the absence of Dean Walker, we called in a pseudo expert, George Davis of Purdue, to assist our other experts, Dean French of Louisiana State and Dean Friday of North Carolina.

We busied ourselves with the technique of reaching what was termed the student of the "lost battalion," reaching the student before his difficulty had become apparent, before it had attracted the attention of the dean, and before it had really become a problem.

We formulated some steps for completing this program (1) of sensitizing the students in general and the faculty body, going back to our problem of communication, to call the attention of counselors to possible or incipient difficulties that might be arising; publicizing the counseling service in the student and faculty publication, orientation programs and elsewhere; conferences with junior counselors, dormitory counselors, house parents, and with other groups of leaders who might in turn advise the counseling service of possible problems, questionnaires to the students themselves as to their own opinions of the desirability of counseling service. It was pointed out in one institution at least, where this had been tried, the dangers involved unless we were prepared to follow up, and this might be applied to any of the publicity that we give to our counseling service.

The question was raised of the part of the psychiatrist in a counseling program. About half of those present indicated that they had the services of a psychiatrist available. No conclusion was reached other than a few deplored the lack of cooperation in some cases. One of our experts advised temperance in counseling, pointing out that in many cases we aggravate a situation by raising new doubts, and consequently new problems, for the student.

Then we took up the problem of counseling for activities, the student who is participating in too few or, more particularly, too many activities, and the merits of the point system were discussed. One of our experts took a contrary point of view, however, pointing out that his feeling was we should encourage the student at all costs to complete his responsibilities, even though it is a bitter lesson for him -- the experience involved. We concluded

that counseling here, as well as elsewhere, should be directed toward encouraging the student to make up his own mind.

We ended with a question, and the question, like most of our others, was not answered, and a discussion of the success of a counseling program which deals primarily with the top and the bottom and leaves untouched the great majority of the middle men who perhaps are not living up to their complete capabilities.

After something in the neighborhood of an hour and a quarter of counseling with each other, we left the problem in the spirit which, in the minds of some of us at any rate, constitutes a true counseling program, to the decision and the opinion of the individual members present. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I think you boys simply admitted what everybody else actually did -- leave the decisions up to the individual men.

For the king-sized, and over-sized colleges, Bob Bishop of the University of Cincinnati.

MR. ROBERT W. BISHOP (University of Cincinnati): Mr. President, in opening the discussion of Group 5 on counseling the chairman and experts of this group suggested that we address our attention to the questions: Why do we counsel? and How do we counsel? These questions were parried by discussing other questions, such as professional and informal types of counseling, and it was later suggested by Dean Turner, I think, that the reason we didn't want to bite in on those questions is that we were all representing the large institutions and that those in the group were largely administrators and not counselors, and didn't know very much about it anyhow.

But after a while we came to an attempt to state the purpose, really, of counseling, as we saw it, and it was this: The purpose of the counseling program is to make understandable to the student the college's major hope for him, that through his intellectual training and development, and his constructive use of facilities and the various aspects of college experience, he may become an intelligent, well-rounded person, prepared and willing to make a constructive contribution to society.

It was emphasized in this connection that no one or two counseling techniques would be sufficient in accomplishing this end, that we would need to use a great many techniques in helping the student discover his bearings and define his purposes.

There was some difference of opinion expressed as to how

much counseling we should do, but it was generally agreed, I think, that there was an enormous amount of room everywhere for more effective counseling, not only for the benefits derived by students, but for certain benefits which may also accrue to the college and university from such a program of effective counseling.

I would like to give some of the points which came out during the entire discussion.

First, an effective counseling program ought to increase the faculty morale, as well as the student's.

Second, it ought to provide useful means of checking on the effectiveness of the curriculum.

Third, it may help build good will for the institution and outside the campus.

Fourth, it can be helpful in maintaining and interpreting purposes of activities in harmony with those of the college or university.

Fifth, a point that I sensed in the whole discussion was that good counseling programs ought to aid in interpreting activities to faculties and in presenting faculty and administration opinion to students.

In discussing the responsibility of the college or university in counseling, it was stated that from the time a student enters college until he leaves it he is confronted by questions and problems whose satisfactory answer and understanding depend, at least in some measure, on information and counsel given him by the college. Most colleges recognize the existence of a great variety of student needs and have taken steps to meet these needs by providing some kind of counseling system. An important factor was noted in this connection that in considering setting up and operating an effective counseling system we had to have more wholehearted and enthusiastic cooperation of faculty members, those who are teaching in the classrooms, and not seated behind desks in an office. In that connection the point was brought out that (I think by Dean Williamson) too often counselors are chained to their desk; they don't get outside on the campus, in activities, and in various ways meet students informally so as to know what is going on, and what they are participating in, and a lot of things that they need to know from the informal side of student life in order to be helpful counselors.

Further discussion indicated that a variety of functions and procedures which are included under the term "counseling", at

the institutions represented, that there was no clear understanding or agreement of how such a program should be coordinated and administered. I think that in this connection it was very pertinent that there was a great need to come to a clear understanding as to how a counseling program could be coordinated, administered and made to function for the best interests of the total college or university community.

It was pointed out that every student encounters normal difficulties but that dean's offices, faculty committees and individuals associated with our respective offices spend most of their time with students below average, and problem and deficiency cases. The group felt that a large number of good and superior students are taking courses that do not challenge their full abilities and that often they have social and emotional problems as a result of courses that do not challenge their full abilities, and therefore ought to have the benefit of wise and friendly counsel on the outside of classrooms, in faculty homes, and in various ways that college and universities can establish informal contacts with students who are of the superior group.

In discussing an area in which there has been very little progress made in large institutions, the statement was made that there is a serious void in religious, moral and ethical values on the part of students today, that counselors have shied away from these very difficult problems, and that perhaps the greatest counseling need today on our campus lies in this area. Many publicly supported colleges and universities have been neutral to religion because of the separation idea of church and state, and this has led to the separation of academic, if you please, education on the one hand from religious and moral values on the other. That seemed to be quite a point and there is a difference of opinion on that, but it was a very definite point discussed.

I think it was generally agreed, however, that neutrality is inevitably unfriendly and that many counselors are not interested in this area of counseling, or are afraid to uphold high religious and moral ideas on the modern university campus. It was the consensus of the group that counselors should do more in this area, that more work could be done without denominational bias or usurpation of the part that ministers, rabbis and priests have in carrying on their respective work; that these student pastors that we have all around and on our campus, some of them, ought to be brought into this program of counseling so that students and faculty members come to more clearly understand that the self is truly a composite of the spirit, the hand and the heart, as well as the mind. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: That completes the report on the

"Counseling" workshop. Is Mr. Blaesser in the room? If so, we will ask him if this arouses any comments.

MR. BLAESSER: I am in the room. I have been listening and enjoying it. No further comments.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Mr. Blaesser is afraid to comment. [Laughter]

MR. BLAESSER: That is an interpretation that is being too directive.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Our communication is poor. [Laughter]

We have a few minutes before we go on for the reports on "Discipline." Does anyone want to get up and raise questions or make comments on the reports that have been received? I think they were all very accurately reported, and we will go on to the report of Workshop No. 4 on "Discipline," and following precedent we will reverse the order and ask first if Dean Stone will give the report for the large colleges. He just stepped out. All right, we will skip over him. We will give him only a "D" if he comes back soon enough. Is Dean McBride of Florida State here to report for the next group?

MR. OTIS MC BRIDE (Florida State University): Mr. Chairman, we wrestled with that problem of discipline in which the dean is able to show himself at his wisest and most tactful best. I give two examples to show that the dean can be at his wisest and most tactful best.

One day Fred Turner went home after a rough day at the office. His wife was sewing. He sat down to relax and read the paper and she said, "Fred, why don't you read to me while I sew?"

He thought for a moment, right fast, and said, "Honey, why don't you sew to me, while I read?" [Laughter]

And then Bill Tate of Georgia has a dean of women in his system -- [Laughter]

MR. TATE: In my hair. [Laughter]

MR. MC BRIDE: Correction! One afternoon she came into his office, returning from the photographer's where she had picked up a picture she had had made, and she asked in somewhat of a rage, "Bill, do you really think this picture looks like me?"

Turning on his southern charm, he said, "Well, my dear, the answer is in the negative." [Laughter]

Scott Goodnight gave us some five problems to struggle with, and we answered all of them except about four and a half. [Laughter]

In order to launch ourselves somewhere we opened up with the problem of who handles the discipline cases. Dean Baldwin said in his institution a faculty committee does the handling. The dean of men is not a member of that committee but is often the guest of the committee, as he is called in or visits with them to give his opinion and share in the deliberations. Some problems in his institution are handled by the dean of men, without going to that committee. Sometimes he gets hold of a situation, accidentally, or in some manner, and may feel in his judgment that it should not go to the committee but should be handled by him, settled and not reported. If it is picked up by the police first, or through some other agency, then it must go to the committee and he will merely deliberate with them.

Dean Miner of Miami University stated that students participate in discipline problems. He has a men's board and a women's board, each board composed of five men and four women. They may meet jointly, if the case is one to call for that. The women are here to stay. As one young man said when his father was unhappy over his report card, pointing out that a little girl up the street made better, the father said, "You wouldn't let a mere girl beat you, would you?" The little boy said, "Daddy, girls aren't nearly so 'mere' as they used to be." [Laughter]

Two opinions were brought forth -- this is not group opinion, but merely opinions expressed by members. One was that the dean of men should be free to counsel without any responsibility for discipline. We didn't settle that one. It has been discussed before. Another was that the dean of men should counsel the student until the case reaches the disciplinary board.

At various points we voted on some of the problems just to go on record some way or other and see how the group felt. Some of the subjects upon which we took a vote are the following: How is discipline handled in your particular institution? How many of the institutions represented had discipline handled by students, within limits? Five. How many have discipline boards of some type? Twenty. In how many of those institutions is the dean of men a member of that board? Eleven. In how many are students only on the board? Five. Students and faculty both represented on the board? Five. The dean of men totally responsible? Two.

There was general agreement on this vote, everybody agreeing to do exactly as he did before the vote was taken.
[Laughter]

Some definitions that were brought forward are:

What is probation? One answer was, "Disciplinary probation would be allowed but once." That is, the student is on probation. If he does it again, or does anything, almost, again, he has had it and his stay at the university is terminated.

Another, the university sets the standards and those students not meeting the standards are regarded as undesirable. A student who is in that category has his enrollment temporarily or permanently ended. When proper desirability has been achieved by that student he may be taken back on probation. That is, he will be on probation after he has begun to fit the customary pattern in some satisfactory manner.

Another opinion (I believe this was Brother Manchester): The university is not a psychological clinic. Pressures on the campus oppose a therapeutic probation period.

Here are some questions that came up, not all of which were answered:

Can there be a legal test of a student court action? There is some question regarding the real legal procedure of the honor court system. We discussed the legal basis of student actions and, for that matter, faculty board actions, at some length and there was rather general agreement on this one that no matter how much the responsibility may be delegated that in the end the president, who is of course responsible to the board of control, the board of trustees, or what have you, is the one where final responsibility will rest, even though somebody else may do the work.

Then we went into a discussion of recording of suspensions on the permanent record. Dean Dunford brought out the fact that some institutions recommend to other institutions students who have been suspended. There was some feeling that maybe students in trouble should stay where they are until that trouble is satisfactorily settled.

There is a story about a young man who was married and found that his wife had to have a tonsillectomy. When the doctor took out her tonsils he said, "The operation was not only necessary at this time but should have been performed when she was twelve."

So the young husband promptly sent the bill to his father-in-law. [Laughter]

That was something of the feeling in this question, that the institution that had the trouble to begin with should go ahead and settle it before sending the student some place else.

Dean Kirwan stated that sometimes a student would be permitted to withdraw in good standing, or with no entry on his record, if he would not be a menace to another institution. I believe Bob Strozier immediately said, "Well, when is that? How can you tell whether he is withdrawing and is innocuous enough that he can be accepted, or isn't?" Then Dean Strozier pointed out that a record is a record. If a man is forced to withdraw, it ought to be put on the record, otherwise it is not quite honest reporting.

At that point, according to democratic procedure, we took a vote. [Laughter] "Are suspensions recorded on the permanent record?" And then, of course, "On the transcript when one is sent out?" We had to split that vote. We took it on two phases. Permanently, fifteen. Temporarily, to be removed at such time as the student may return to the institution and be in good standing again, four.

Dean Penberthy asked, "Is a faculty committee used as a court of appeal?"

Dean Strozier expressed the opinion that the dean of students should be the court of appeal; that major cases might be referred to a psychiatrist or to some other proper agency of referral.

Dean Tate commented that in Georgia the dean of men and the dean of women pass on the admission of any student who has been suspended by another institution.

It was at that point that the clock struck ten and we had agreed that we would quit at ten. So in closing, I should run in the line that you used to see at the Saturday night serials, "Don't miss the next installment of this interesting business," and I presume that there will be another installment at this meeting next year. [Laughter and applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: The Secretary better make a note of that guy's name. If Tate ever runs out on us, we may need another sort of a toastmaster. [Laughter] With Tate, "Shorty" Nowotny and Mr. McBride, we ought to keep ourselves fairly well amused. Half the value of these meetings is taking home some

stories that you can use as though they were your own.

I saw Dean Stone come into the room. Did he stay in? Okay, you have a "D" now. A fellow who has been in this game as long as you have knows that the teacher does not always go from A to Z in calling on people. Dean Stone.

MR. H. E. STONE (University of California): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the conference: My apologies, Mr. Chairman. You crossed up the signals on me.

After going through three workshops with Group 5, our panel on "Discipline" decided we would dodge the pitfall into which the three previous panels had been dropped by their briefers. Those briefers had been colleagues and presumably friendly guys, yet on this platform they took the role of "dictators" and put our groups, previous chairmen and experts behind the proverbial 8-ball. After this experience, our panel on "Discipline" decided to steal a march on our briefer, so we met at early morning breakfast yesterday. We drew up an outline and agenda for our meeting. We locked hands across the breakfast table, breathed a silent prayer, and marched en masse over to Scott Goodnight, who was now at breakfast, and we informed him in a tone of authority, which did not come from the bottom, as to just what our program would be. Well, the good dean and general NABOB just smiled. He congratulated us on our early rising, said our approach would be fine, and that he didn't intend to make a speech, just ask a few questions. We felt greatly relieved and relaxed, but alas, we did not reckon properly with that cagey and spirited old war horse. He took the platform before the entire congregation last night, and I leave it to you as to whether or not he made a speech. He was the fiery impersonation of discipline itself. He debunked, deflated and demanded! Worst of all he demanded answers and answers to his questions. Oh yes, he was honest with us, he "just asked questions" but what questions! He even had the audacity to ask "what is the purpose of discipline?"

After that session, the chairman and his panel of experts stumbled out of this hall, huddled in a little group in the driven snow outside the door and were picked up with compassion by the bus driver and hauled bodily to our workshop. We tried to force through a motion for immediate adjournment, we suggested group singing around the beautiful spinet piano sitting so invitingly in our workshop room but all to no avail. Our colleagues insisted that we go on with the show and worst of all that we answer Dean Scott Goodnight's questions. Well we were trapped and like all trapped animals we began to try to fight our way through and out of that brush and barbed wire entanglement. We fought for

an hour and a half and truthfully never did get out but here are some of our accomplishments:

1. We got a unanimous but silent and motionless vote of approval on this answer to the question "what is discipline and its purpose?"

"Discipline is that function in education the objective of which is to contribute to good conduct and character development, and to safeguard the institution and its students from anti-social acts."

We agreed that a university may properly effect its students and student organizations to observe the commonly accepted standards of morality and good taste, to obey the laws of the state and the community and to conduct themselves and their group activities in a manner compatible with the educational purposes of the institution.

We agreed that the obligation of a university to promote and require high standards of conduct is no less than its obligation to promote high standards of scholarship.

2. Still with our eyes on Scott Goodnight's questions and under the pressure of his spiritual presence we moved on to a consideration of the best organization or machinery for the administration of discipline.

Well frankly we couldn't find any best organization or administrative machinery. With 57 institutions represented we found 57 different forms of organization all of which seem to work. We did discover certain general trends and general areas of agreement.

(a) There seemed to be evidence of increasing confidence in and use of committees on student conduct which include at least members of the faculty with appropriate professional background in sociology, psychology and social work. There seemed to be general confidence in the advice of psychiatrists if such psychiatrists are on the institution's staff. Some include a psychiatrist on the committee, others use him as professional advisor.

(b) There was considerable divergence as to the use of students and student committees in discipline administration. Students lack the background of training and experience to deal with the complex problems presented by many if not most of deviate behavior patterns associated with sex perversions and abnormalities, theft, alcoholism and even chronic cheating. Students and

student committees may be and are very constructively helpful in developing student community and group attitudes, in dealing with infractions of certain fraternity and student body regulations and their utilization in the administrative process should not be discarded.

(c) We found little or no support for the contention that a dean of men or dean of students should be relieved of all discipline responsibility. Some of our deans serve as chairmen of the discipline or conduct committees, others serve as voting members, still others work in an advisory capacity with these committees but practically all have and accept major responsibility and see in this responsibility an opportunity for progressive educational leadership, for rehabilitating offenders for lives of good citizenship and for constructively influencing campus-wide attitudes and standards of wholesome conduct.

3. After leaving the problems of organization we got into the still hotter water of procedures, techniques and policies for dealing with certain types of serious offenses.

On your question, Dean Goodnight, as to how severe, or how mild should discipline be we came up with your own formula and statistic "4 point 7", that is to say, for the benefit of those who have not studied statistics, 4 on the side of mildness and 7 on the point of being mild. Seriously we found little support for a policy of rigid severity for severity's sake or for severe punishment as a consistent policy in therapy or prevention. Punishment to be sure may be used at times with good therapeutic results and must at times be used for the protection of the institution, punishment to the extent of summary dismissals or prolonged suspensions. More confidence however is placed in the techniques of careful case studies supported if need be by professional diagnoses and in counseling for redirection and motivation.

We agreed that the decisions with reference to disciplinary action should be announced to the student through personal interview and that these decisions should be reported to the parents of minors. In certain cases such as sex perversions, real alcoholism, or chronic thievery the deans of professional schools, particularly education, should be informed.

The problems of homosexuality and sex perversion were discussed. Although recognizing that most of such cases should be regarded as illness and treated as such, when the offense and the offender are publicly identified by police arrest, newspaper publicity, etc., separation from the institution by voluntary or compulsory action is almost essential to the welfare of the

university if not indeed for the welfare of the student involved.

The necessity for close coordination and cooperation between the dean's office and the campus police was stressed. All of us envied Fred Turner and his well-trained competent Security Officer who serves as a member of his staff.

A number of other questions were raised and answers exchanged informally but time prevents amplification in detail.

In conclusion our Group 5 Workshop on "Discipline" does not believe that our modern university and college youth are "going to the dogs." They are in all probability the most law-abiding and ethically conscientious group in our present society. In the responsibility for participating in the discipline work we see another opportunity for good counseling, for education in character development, for supplementing the forces of home, school and church to the end that good citizenship in the best sense of that term shall characterize the youth of the campus where each of us serves.

Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Thank you, Dean Stone. I think that on the basis of that report we will change your final mark and let you pass.

For the middle-size colleges, Dean Godolphin of Princeton was the chairman and will report.

DEAN F. R. B. GODOLPHIN (Princeton University): This is where we really begin to speed up. After all, we have just had the climax, the finale, the finished report expressed to us.

I think I might further call the attention of those who were with me to the fact that Dean McBride must really have been in our session because the topics he discussed, and the attitudes presented, are substantially those which we had in Group 3. Consequently, I am in the happy position of being able to add a couple of little footnotes and sit down.

We stressed the two points, the type of committee to control discipline problems which got into the variety -- all students, all faculty, mixed students and faculty, students for certain types, faculty for other types, and so on. We didn't get anything like the University of Wisconsin combination of ten committees for discipline, but we got several varieties.

We did strike one rather curious thing. In the minds of some members of the Workshop the student committee really handles the cases that were trivial or that the dean did not wish to be bothered with, and in others the student committee had extreme responsibility. In one case, say a university with an honor system where the students enforce it, they really determine whether the man is required to withdraw from the university or permitted to continue. In the case of cheating, in one instance, we discovered that the student committee cannot only recommend no credit for the course in which the cheating took place, but no credit for the term. So you see the split between the student committee which only handles traffic violations and things of that sort and this other type of student committee which has very grave responsibility.

I think the experience of most people who have student committees with high responsibility was that the students were able to measure up to it, were able to meet it. So that would be one significant element in considering the particular structure in any given college.

One other point that might be added to what has already been said in the area of types of punishment. We ran into quite a variety of opinions there. In some colleges you tend to have a term, a year, or an indefinitely long suspension and probation used, or something of that sort, for a less serious offense. In other colleges we found, in the extreme instance, my own, the lightest suspension is an indefinite period. It means really only for three to five days and then the term is progressively severe. The sharp line of demarcation is between the suspension of a part of the term with the consequent scholastic disruption and the suspension used primarily for at least a term and from there on up to an indefinite period.

One point that seemed to emerge, which corroborates what has previously been said, is that expulsion is less used under that name. I say "under that name" because the indefinite suspension where you have no intention of ever taking the man back certainly achieves the result.

We also found instances where the voluntary withdrawal under fire was permitted and there we ran into the same difficulty that Dean McBride mentioned -- what happens to the student's record if he tries to go elsewhere? In some instances we found that although it was a voluntary withdrawal it was labeled, on recommendation of the dean of students, thereby putting any other institution on warning before they took the man, "You better write and find out what the story is behind it."

One other rather interesting technique was that of a conditional suspension whereby the student must present his case-- his analysis of the situation, his offense, his reaction to it -- and substantially set the terms on which he may be permitted to continue in college. It seemed to some of us that there is a good deal of merit in that. If he sets down his own conditions, with the clear understanding that any further violation will not be a subject for dispute, it will automatically mean that he is required to withdraw; you may have room for some of the counseling of a remedial sort which can go on, but it does not leave you with simply the loose ends; no matter what you do, you can still continue and carry on without any fear of serious consequences from the standpoint of the university. So that sort of a proposal seemed to some of us to be a suggestion that might be adapted to universities which don't use it, or at least might be considered.

As for fundamental issues of the philosophy, Group 3 was much too tired and adjourned too early. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: In Group 2 we had a substitute chairman and Dean Burts of Mercer filled the bill, and will make the report.

MR. RICHARD C. BURTS (Mercer University): Mr. Chairman, three years ago a committee of sports writers was set up to make a study of the record of pinch-hitters. That committee found that pinch-hitters had a batting average of 176. [Laughter]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: There must have been some very high batting averages to reach that. [Laughter]

MR. BURTS: I wish to make some defense of Scott Goodnight. He was referred to, in one or two reports ago, as the old war horse. I personally believe that Scott Goodnight doesn't deserve the title "old war horse." I think that he has not changed a hair since we saw him last. [Laughter]

We went right down the line, however, on the points which he put up. There was an implicit understanding among our committee that morons, criminals and that third classification of which we did not speak, were not the ones with which we were principally concerned in this discipline area. They would be weeded out without this type of continuing concern for the welfare of the student whom we know as a bona fide student and not a misplaced misfit. It was our general conclusion that the purpose of discipline, the primary purpose, was constructive. We kept a constructive interpretation on discipline throughout the evening.

In the second point, on the severity or mildness of discipline, we attempted to distinguish between persons who have committed breaches of our rules and regulations. We feel that every disciplinary action ought to be an individual action, without regard to the more general civil procedure of going according to precedent. We think that precedent needs to be understood and adjusted on our college campuses. We attempted to distinguish between a first offender and a chronic offender. There was some controversy however, saying that the first offender who is himself a potential should be caught up in a decisive action even on the first occasion. So we felt that individually that action should be individualistic.

The third point, who should handle discipline, that Scott Goodnight threw out, we were not able to adequately handle because we countered with another question which we thought would apply to that point of Scott's: Who makes the rules that are to be enforced? The question was thrown out but was not adequately taken up and I think that would be a good point of departure for other considerations in the area of discipline, the understanding being that rules are made essentially from the top to be enforced by somebody down some way from the top, and we are not able to enforce rules unless we are a party to them or believe very wholeheartedly in the background of them.

The fourth question, should the disciplinary committee be faculty and/or student -- most of us indicated that we had a faculty committee. Also a majority of us indicated that most of our disciplinary cases did not get as far as the disciplinary committee. Many of our cases stopped with the dean and in many instances, at the point of consultation with the dean, the culprit was given an opportunity to present his case to the committee, and in most instances the students wished to have their cases not presented to the committee. So the dean is the man who is the administrator of this disciplinary action.

The main break we found in student administered discipline is not in concept, it is not in lack of severity, because we are generally agreed that student groups were more severe than faculty groups generally are. We felt that to build a sense of responsibility and a sense of honor in a student group would keep morale high and is good for the campus as a whole. However, there is a conflict in group loyalty in having one student report another student, and we felt that the reporting system is the weakness of the student-administered disciplinary program. They are generally perfectly capable of handling the matters once the facts are clearly presented and the case is clearly presented, but taking the initiative in turning up those cases is the drawback in most of the student-administered programs.

The fifth question, should the dean be a disciplinarian, by and large our workshop answered the question "yes." In doing so we recalled that we were seconding John Bergstraesser in his appearance before us last year at Highland Park. Most of us felt that as administrative officers we could not avoid the administration of discipline as part of our general administrative duties.

Most of the rest of the evening developed into a testimonial affair with each man presenting something of his own cases and how he had dealt with them. Most of us agreed it was a very profitable session. We extended our session beyond the time which was normally allowed, I understand. That was some evidence of our interest and success in this seminar. At the end we got up and joined hands in a friendship circle and with one accord said, "Good night." [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: The administration of this organization has no objection to anybody working overtime, as long as they don't present a bill for it. [Laughter]

The small college group, Dean R. D. Hassler of Moravian College served as chairman and we will ask for his report.

MR. R. D. HASSLER (Moravian College): Dean Neidlinger, gentlemen: At the risk of presenting Exhibit A as evidence that our system of communication fails in one or another of the areas, as defined by Mr. Barnard, it is reported that Group 1 in Workshop IV determined at the outset to limit its discussion to the several suggested questions of the counselor Dean Emeritus Goodnight.

Let me say at this point that if Dean Goodnight fails to recognize any similarity in the questions discussed and those which he actually suggested the system of communication failed in the area of the inability of the hearer to understand and not in the area of inadequate presentation by Dean Goodnight.

Discussion of the primary purpose of discipline, whether for punishment, as a deterrent, for the protection of the group, or for rehabilitation of the individual, led to the conclusion that the primary purpose is modified by the specific problem, but that in each case there should be educational value for the individual.

Beyond this there seemed to be some general agreement that discipline, whatever the primary purpose, should not be the mere application of a set of "all purpose" rules, though there might well be a few broad general statements.

The question of the kind of discipline, the severity or the mildness of the measure, the presence or absence of imposed punishment was again related to the specific nature of the problem and, therefore, no generalized conclusion was reached, unless dissatisfaction with some part of all disciplinary procedures is a conclusion.

For purposes of discussion the problem of class attendance was used. Techniques and systems reported included the more or less general "cut system" with various types of penalties, the inclusion of absences or the reports of the student without penalty and the attempt to correlate regularity of class attendance with later requirements for satisfactory employment. The variation in the handling of this single common problem offered is illustrative of the differences in the concepts of the purposes and the kind of discipline.

Who shall be the disciplinarian, was not discussed for the reason that it was believed that the problem had to be resolved in accordance with the existing pattern on the particular campus. Lack of time prevented any reference to the place and responsibility of the trained specialist in discipline.

Throughout the discussion it was constantly re-emphasized that (1) the code for the college and the approach to the problem should be positive rather than negative, and (2) that discipline is an essential part of an educational process, though the effectiveness per se is not necessarily a function of the degree of the severity of a penalty.

Finally there seemed to be general agreement that the effectiveness of discipline is largely conditioned by the honesty, the fairness and the integrity of the disciplinarian and sympathy and love for the student, which suggests the phrase of "mercy tempered with justice." How else can one explain the effectiveness of the late Dean Clark of Illinois and late Dean Coulter of Purdue, two men who differed widely in philosophy but shared the quality of honesty, integrity, and love in their administrative relationships.

One further word of apology. If the members of Group 1 in Workshop IV are mildly surprised in the accuracy or lack of it in this report, the fault lies solely in the chairman who has added some further evidence in support of the failure in the system of communication by his limitation of (a) the ability to understand and (b) to transmit.

Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Well now, is Scott in the room? Do you want to get up and try to mark these fellows, Scott? By gosh, I guess he was afraid to face you. [Laughter] I was hoping that we could get him to spend the next half hour in answering some of those questions that he had raised.

Has anyone any comment that you want to make, or question that you want to put to these people on the subject of discipline? We are ahead of our schedule. We are not going to wait to go along with it, but we have some time if there are some questions that anybody would like to ask of general interest.

No questions. I guess we have this bunch talked out, Fred. That being the case I think we can take a two or three minutes stretch and breather here without losing all of you out of the room.

We will adjourn for five minutes flat.

... Recess ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: If we come to order, I am going to let John make the announcement about the picture which is here, and looks very good. It will be up on the bulletin board.

... Announcement in re Convention picture ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We are now in session for the business session of the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men, which is a necessary procedure.

I will call first on Dean Arno J. Haack, who is chairman of the Resolutions Committee, to present to us the resolutions prepared by that committee. Dean Haack.

MR. HAACK: Mr. Chairman, the members of my committee met, with two exceptions, at the breakfast table at the unearthly hour of seven-thirty this morning, and have been transacting business ever since. For the record, the members of that committee are:

Dean C. V. Bredt, University of Texas
 Dean Arden O. French, Louisiana State University
 Dean Frank R. Hunt, Lafayette College
 Dean Joseph A. Park, Ohio State University
 Dean V. F. Spathelf, Wayne University
 Dean Erich A. Walter, University of Michigan

The first resolution is a resolution of appreciation.

"BE IT RESOLVED: That the Conference express its appreciation:

"A. To President John E. Pomfret, Dean J. Wilfred Lambert, Dean John Hocutt and their associates for their hospitality and attention to every detail of this most successful Conference. The success of this Conference has been largely due to the spirit reflected through careful planning and minute consideration for the happiness and personal welfare of the delegates arranged by William and Mary College officials. The spirit of this great historical University will be long remembered by all who have had the privilege of attending. In behalf of the wives appreciation is also expressed for the hospitality extended to them.

"B. To the officials of Colonial Williamsburg for a demonstration of their personal interest in providing all of their facilities for the comfort of the delegates and thus demonstrating a spirit of concern for every phase of the Conference. Especially do we appreciate the efforts made to interpret the historical

significance of the restoration program in the preservation of tangible evidence of our great American heritage. The personal enthusiasm of the leaders of Colonial Williamsburg has encouraged the delegates to carry the message of this project to their respective localities."

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I will entertain no argument on that resolution and I will entertain a rising vote of approval.

... The assembly arose and applauded ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: So ordered.

MR. HAACK: Resolution No. 2.

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: By the members of the NADAM that we go on record as officially expressing our appreciation to the Executive Committee for its untiring efforts in working out and planning the program of our Conference, and be it further

"RESOLVED: That we express approval of the pattern of the program carried out at this meeting and recommend continuation along these lines in the future."

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Is there any objection to that resolution? If not, it is so ordered.

MR. HAACK: Resolution No. 3.

"Whereas, word of the sudden illness of Dr. C. Gilbert Wrenn having reached our Conference, be it

"RESOLVED: That the following message be sent to Dr. Wrenn: 'Word of your illness reported at the Williamsburg Conference of the NADAM prompted spontaneous resolution expressing our sympathy and best wishes for a speedy recovery'."

This message has already been sent. [Laughter] We voted on that so it is entirely legal. It is included here for the record.

Resolution No. 4, Dean Nicholson.

"Whereas, the members of NADAM in annual convention assembled note with sadness the death during the past year of Dean Emeritus Edward E. Nicholson,

"Whereas, Dean Nicholson of the University of Minnesota was a loved and respected member of this body, one of its founders

in Madison, Wisconsin in 1919, its president during 1921 and 1922, and its secretary from 1922 to 1924, therefore be it

"RESOLVED: That the Association record with deep sorrow the death of Dean Nicholson and pause in convention assembled for a period of silent tribute to his memory and in sympathy for his family; and be it

"RESOLVED: That a copy of this resolution be sent to members of his family."

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I am very certain that everyone who knew Dean Nicholson, as most of us did, approve this resolution. For those of you who did not know him, I am sure you can approve it with the utmost confidence, and I will ask you now to stand in a moment of silent tribute to Dean Nicholson.

... The assembly arose and stood in silent tribute to Dean Nicholson ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: It is so ordered.

MR. HAACK: Resolution No. 5, to the U. S. Commissioner of Education.

"Whereas, the Commissioner of Education of these United States has seen fit to incorporate within the services of his office, staff assistance to the area of Student Personnel Services and has appointed to this task an esteemed member of this Association, therefore be it

"RESOLVED: That this body extend its congratulations to the Commissioner of Education and heartily endorse the wisdom of his appointment; be it further

"RESOLVED: That we extend to Mr. Willard Blaesser the congratulations of this Association and its hearty best wishes of success in this pioneer opportunity which is his."

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Is there anyone who wishes to rise and take exception to that resolution? If not, it is so ordered.

MR. HAACK: We are doing all right so far. Resolution No. 6, addressed to the National Interfraternity Conference.

"Whereas, the lack of effective undergraduate participation in the National Interfraternity Conference has resulted

in widespread dissatisfaction at the Campus level, and

"Whereas, Deans of Men and Deans of Students have found it difficult to interpret this situation with any degree of honesty, therefore be it

"RESOLVED: That this organization point out to the National Interfraternity Conference the opportunity in its regional and national conferences to practice the type of open and free discussion which we encourage at the local level and which our students have been trained to expect. We have faith that if this process is encouraged, some of the most difficult problems in human relations with which the fraternities are wrestling will come to a more early and harmonious resolution."

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I may say that that is in line with a similar vote taken by the Executive Committee at our meeting on Thursday.

Is there any discussion of the resolution? If not, will all those in favor please say "aye." Opposed "no." It is so ordered.

MR. HAACK: Resolution No. 7, to the National Student Association.

"Whereas, the discussions in the conference, of the National Association of Deans and Advisers of men have centered increasingly on devices for expanding opportunities for student representation and expression in many areas of institutional concern, and

"Whereas, this group takes cognizance of the efforts of the National Student Association to aid student thinking and to expedite effective organization on the local campus, therefore be it

"RESOLVED: That it is our belief that mutual interests and concerns can best be served by concentrating our efforts on establishing and implementing effective channels of cooperation,

"That in our judgment emphasis on rigid and arbitrary definition as to the rights and prerogatives of any or all segments of university community injects an essentially false issue and is productive of confusion and frustrations in a setting which is ripe for increased mutual understanding and more effective cooperation."

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Is there anyone who wishes to speak on that resolution? Is there anyone who wishes to take exception to it? If not, those in favor please say "aye." Opposed. It is so ordered.

MR. HAACK: Resolution No. 8, to the Veterans Administration.

"Whereas, it has been officially designated by the Veterans Administration that eligibility under the P.L. 346 (as amended) relative to higher education shall be terminated on July 25, 1951, and

"Whereas, there yet remain to be defined many interpretations as to the implication of this ruling for veterans affected, therefore be it

"RESOLVED: That this body call upon the authorities involved for a statement to be issued as soon as possible so that the best interests of the potential student veteran may be served prior to that date and in order that counselling may be directed with clarity and effective purpose."

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: My understanding is that this resolution does not attempt to quarrel with the date that they have established, and that we are simply asking them if they are sticking to that date that they give certain decisions which are necessary for our counselling at the earliest possible time.

Is there anyone who wants to speak on that resolution? If not, will all those in favor say "aye." Opposed. So ordered.

MR. HAACK: Resolution No. 9, Scope and Financing of Personnel Function.

"Whereas, it is the consensus of the NADAM that our work is seriously impeded by the failure of university and college executives to recognize the full significance of the scope of student service which we provide, therefore be it

"RESOLVED: That NADAM urge its executives to reevaluate our total contribution to the college or university community in comparison with all other departments of the institution, and that they be compared particularly with the teaching units, to the end that our contributions may be more proportionately reflected at all levels of executive planning, including the financial."

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Is there any question on that resolution? I would simply question the statement as to the meaning of NADAM advising our executives. Does the committee have in mind that NADAM should send some communication to college presidents, or simply prepare such a statement?

MR. HAACK: I think all the committee had in mind was that any clear statement to this end, that our Executive Committee could draw up, would be helpful. We were not explicit as to what kind of statement.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: In other words, we will understand that it is simply a statement to be made available for the use of our members when they want to put the pressure on their executives and superiors in college.

Is there any discussion of that resolution? If not, all those in favor of it please say "aye." Opposed "no." I would rule that the resolution was carried. Does anyone wish to take exception to that ruling? If not, it is ordered.

MR. HAACK: Those are all of the formal resolutions that our committee has to present.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Is there anyone who wishes to present resolutions from the floor? If not, we will move on to the next item of business, which is the report of the Committee on time and place, and simultaneously, the report of the committee on Nominations.

Has Scott Goodnight returned? If he has not, Joe, are you prepared to give the report of that committee?

Before doing so, I meant to include you on our previous program, Joe, because I think we really ought to have a report from the committee on women's activities, which I understand you have carefully supervised. [Laughter]

MR. J. A. BURSLEY (University of Michigan): Thank you, sir. I am glad of the opportunity to make that report. In the first place, I would like to say that I am not responsible for this report, because at the time of the meeting of the committee, which adopted this report, I was attending to my other business at the tea given over at the Lodge for the women of the group. I went over there and had a very nice time yesterday afternoon while this committee was working on a report, which I have been asked to present, but for which I assume no responsibility as I was not there.

In the first place, we didn't have any opportunity to choose a secretary for the next two years, because he was chosen last year and according to the constitution, he holds office for three years. So we have Fred Turner here with us for some time to come. I might add, I think we are all very glad of that.
[Applause]

Here comes Scott now. Would you like to come up here and take your place, Scott? Come on. I had a chance to avoid all responsibilities. Now you can come up and take it.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We are in the process of having the report of the committee on nominations, place and nominations, Scott. We drafted a poor substitute for you here. [Laughter]

MR. BURSLEY: He is a little late. That is the only thing about that. [Laughter] Here is the report right here.

MR. S. H. GOODNIGHT (University of Wisconsin): I don't trust your report. You have reported on the Secretary? All right.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We want to know first, have you completed your investigation of his disciplinary action? [Laughter]

MR. GOODNIGHT: Quite.

There is a slate of three officers to be elected, a president and two vice-presidents, and as nominees for those three positions your committee respectfully presents the names of Dean Wesley P. Lloyd of Brigham Young University for President; R. C. Beaty of the University of Florida, for Vice-President; and Victor F. Spathelf of Wayne University for another Vice-President.

MR. BURSLEY: I move the nominations be closed.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: You have heard the nominations from the Nominations Committee, and a motion that the nominations be closed and that the Secretary be instructed to cast one ballot for the candidates of the Nominations Committee. Do I hear that motion seconded?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Any objections to that motion? If not, all those in favor of it say "aye." Opposed "no." The election of Dean Lloyd, Dean Beaty and Dean Spathelf is hereby declared.

We will now have the report of the Committee on Time and Place.

MR. GOODNIGHT: In general, the policy of the Association with regard to selecting meeting places has been to meet in the Middle West, then in the Far West, back in the Middle West, then to the East, back to the Middle West, and so on. Three years ago we met at Michigan, Middle West; two years ago we went to Dallas, Texas, West; again last year, one year ago, at Chicago, Middle West; now this year on the East Coast. So we return this next year to the Middle West, and your committee recommends -- before I disclose that, however [laughter] I am asked to ask the sense of this organization membership with regard to attempting a Far Western meeting in 1952.

The boys from the West Coast have patiently come these long distances for years, and have never raised any great protest, and it looks to the committee as though they ought to get a break. Those of you who would like to see the meeting for 1952 placed in the Far West, although we are making no final motion on it at all, but we would like to have your sentiment, will you please indicate by a show of hands whether you would like to go to the West Coast in 1952. [Raising of hands] Thank you. That seems to be very good.

SECRETARY TURNER: Scott, could we also raise the question as to those who think they might have difficulty in arranging the budgetary angles to go to the Far West, just to get an idea on that.

MR. GOODNIGHT: Secretary Turner would like to have me ask whether there are those among you who think that budgetary difficulties would make it impossible for you to attend the meeting on the West Coast in 1952. If there are, will you show your hands? Those of you who think it might be impossible? [Raising of hands]

SECRETARY TURNER: About twenty.

MR. GOODNIGHT: Thank you.

MR. HURFORD E. STONE (University of California): I would like to suggest there have been some budgetary difficulties on the West Coast for a number of years.

MR. GOODNIGHT: My fellow NABOB Joe Bursley suggests that a meeting on the West Coast might be held in the summer time, so you would have more time, and possibly those of you who might have difficulty in getting train expenses met might drive.

The place for next year that we have selected is St. Louis, with Washington University as host institution. Thank you. [Applause]

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I am sure that the Committee on Time and Place gave very careful consideration to their decision in making that selection. It is the privilege of anyone who wants to take exception to it, however, to speak now. If not -- [Cries of "When?"]

SECRETARY TURNER: That is set by the Executive Committee.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: The time is set by the Executive Committee. I think you can understand it will be approximately at this same time of the year. And we can be sure of having snow in St. Louis. We always have. [Laughter]

If there is no objection made to that report, I will consider that the acceptance of it is approved.

SECRETARY TURNER: Could we get an indication from the group as to the choice, March or a little later in April? We are a little early this time. Several people said, "What is the possibility of holding it a little later in April?"

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: All right, can I ask for a show of hands as to those men who not only would prefer to see it a little later, but who would find it just as, or perhaps more, convenient to attend at a little later date. The sentiment of those who raise their hands would be simply in favor of trying to schedule it perhaps two weeks later than the present time. Do you want to raise your hands on that? [Raising of hands] There seems to be a favorably substantial agreement on that. Let's have an answer to the other question, not whether you would prefer, but whether a change in date would interfere with the plans of any of you to attend, or are there those to whom a later date would be unacceptable.

MR. R. S. GRIFFIN (University of Nevada): Shouldn't this committee take into consideration setting this date at the time of Easter next year. There are a good many people who have other commitments and responsibilities over Easter, where they might not like to commit themselves to this conference at that time.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Let's consider that a recommendation to the Executive Committee that they take into account the date of Easter. I won't ask any of you whether you know your religious calendar to know when that falls next year.

MR. D. H. GARDNER (University of Akron): The 25th of March.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: We will not meet on Sunday, the 25th of March.

There is now place on the agenda of this meeting for any Old Business. Have we any Old Business to attend to, Fred?

SECRETARY TURNER: No.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Do any of you recall any Old Business? If not, we will pass by Old Business and give you an opportunity for New Business.

The Secretary-Treasurer hands me an invitation from the National Independent Students' Association:

"On behalf of the Executive Committee of the National Independent Student Association, I should like to extend a cordial invitation to all members of the National Association of Deans and Advisors of Men to attend the National Convention to be held at the University of Indiana, Bloomington, Indiana, April 20, 21, and 22.

"This is primarily a student convention. However, a large number of faculty advisors and Deans have already indicated their intention of attending.

"Reservations may be made with the N.I.S.A. Convention committee, Room 309 Union Building, Bloomington, Indiana."

Any of you who wish to attend can consider that an invitation.

Is there anyone who has any new business they would like to present from the floor of this convention? Fred, do you have any new business?

SECRETARY TURNER: No, nothing further.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Then I think that we come to the end of our business meeting.

I am going to call on the new officers to stand in a moment, but before doing so, I simply want to make my farewell address in a very few words, which is first to express my very real appreciation for some 150 odd members of this group who have had some part on this program. It was simply amazing. I think that both Fred and myself, when we tried to make the assignments and found that there were so many of you that we were going to have to call on to take some part in it, as chairman or recorders,

or experts, or dictators, or counsellors, or briefers, or one of the other jobs that had to be done. I think they have been done well and I certainly appreciate the cooperation that we have had from you.

In addition to the formal resolution which has been passed, I want to express my own feeling of thanks and appreciation for what Dean Hocutt, Dean Lambert have done in arranging this. I had no conception of the multitudinous things that had to be taken care of and decisions that had to be made, in order to have a convention of this kind run smoothly and to take care of you as comfortably as I am sure that we have here.

I want to once more simply express my admiration for Fred Turner, without whom no president of this Association would get to first base, and I am very happy that I can assure Wes Lloyd that as long as Fred is his Secretary, he need have no apprehension about having a successful administration.

I think now, so that they will be known to you in case they are not already known as they should be, I would like Dean Beaty, our new Vice-President, to stand, if he will, so that he can be recognized. [Applause as he arose]

Now if Dean Spathelf will stand so that we can know who he is. [Applause as he arose]

And now, in accordance with the custom and long tradition of this Association, I would like to ask for the new President, Dean Wesley Lloyd, to step forward and take the gavel and adjourn the meeting. Dean Lloyd. [Applause as he came forward and assumed the Chair]

PRESIDENT-ELECT WESLEY P. LLOYD (Brigham Young University): In response to orders from our outgoing President, and in recognition of one of the longest walks I have ever taken from that Chair up to this place, and in realization of the fact that I am now in this somewhat elevated situation, I want to remind you that the elevation is merely a physical arrangement, rather than any other kind that could occur.

In response to orders from our Past President, and in congratulations to him for a most outstanding convention and meetings, I now declare this session and this year's conference adjourned. [Applause]

... The Convention adjourned at three-forty-five o'clock ...

BANQUET SESSION

March 17, 1950

The meeting convened at eight-twenty-five o'clock, President Neidlinger presiding.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Ladies and gentlemen: There are times certainly when it is not without advantage to a dean to have the reputation of being a sober person -- times and connotations in which it isn't without advantage. But certainly on a festive occasion of this kind I am smart enough to realize that the assignment of being Master of Ceremonies ought to go to one who can be more congenial and witty, without requiring the amount of stimulation which it might take to get me out of my normal sober mood.

So I am very shortly going to turn this assignment over to Bill Tate. But before doing that I have the pleasure and the honor of introducing the guests which we have at the head table and at the center table here so that you will know who they are. I will ask them, when I call their names, if they will be kind enough simply to rise so that you can recognize them.

I find that in most cases I am going to have to couple up some husbands and wives here because certainly the gracious thing to do would be to introduce the wife first, but so that you can identify her connection I have titles only for the husbands. [Laughter]

As far as the head table is concerned, I will start by asking Mrs. Pomfret, the wife of President Pomfret, if she will rise. [Applause as she arose]

I am going to skip Dr. Gross because he will be properly introduced later, and introduce a person whom we have wronged, and I feel that the great error of my administration at NADAM was first in being somewhat responsible for the decision that Dean Katherine Jeffers, Dean of Women at the College of William and Mary, could not join us at our meetings, and I am sure that after you have seen her [Applause as she arose] that you will feel on all accounts that that was an error. [Laughter]

At the end of the table we have Dean Lambert, who I am sure we have all met and been indebted to before. [Applause as he arose]

I am very happy to be able to introduce Mrs. Gross. [Applause as she arose]

I shall skip President Pomfret, who will be introduced later, and introduce to you Mrs. Lambert. [Applause as she arose]

I am sure that the new president of NADAM, Dean Wesley Lloyd -- not Dean Brigham Young [laughter] -- requires no special introduction. [Applause as he arose]

At the center table we have Dr. Vernon M. Geddy, who has spoken to you, and Mrs. Geddy. [Applause as they arose]

We have Mr. James Cogar, who is also on our program, and we have no Mrs. Cogar. [Applause as he arose]

And "Bill" Bates, who has been a member of the local committee, and Mrs. Bates. [Applause as they arose]

Dr. Willard Blaesser, who is the Director of Student Personnel, Specialist in Student Personnel, for the Department of Higher Education and a former dean, and Mrs. Blaesser. [Applause as they arose]

Dean John Hocutt and Mrs. Hocutt need no special introduction, and I will ask them to stand too. [Applause as they arose]

Mr. Charles Duke, the Bursar of the College of William and Mary, and Mrs. Duke. [Applause as they arose]

Dean Nelson Marshall, dean of the College at the College of William and Mary, and Mrs. Marshall. [Applause as they arose]

Mr. William Barnes, President of the National Interfraternity Conference. [Applause as he arose]

Dean George Oliver, the Director of the Summer Session at William and Mary, and Mrs. Oliver. [Applause as they arose]

Colonel C. A. Chapman, Colonel retired, who was formerly at the University of Illinois and is a resident at Williamsburg, and Mrs. Chapman. [Applause as they arose]

Dr. Harold Fowler, Professor of History at the College of William and Mary, and a Dartmouth graduate [laughter], and Mrs. Fowler. [Applause as they arose]

Dean E. G. Williamson, the distinguished freshman member of NADAM. [Laughter and applause as he arose]

Last but certainly not least in any meeting of this occasion, Dean Fred H. Turner, Secretary-Treasurer of NADAM, dean of students at the University of Illinois, and Mrs. Turner. [Applause as they arose]

Now that all the "stuffed shirts" have been introduced [laughter] I will turn you over to Dean Bill Tate, who will carry on the program.

Now, wait a minute. I guess I am out of order already, because before Dean Tate takes over, we are to hear a number of selections from the singers of the Williamsburg Choral group.

... Selections by the Colonial Williamsburg Quintet ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: I am now both relieved and very happy to turn over this pulpit to the Reverend William Tate, [laughter] dean of the University of Georgia. Dean Tate.

... Applause as Dean William Tate assumed the Chair ...

TOASTMASTER TATE: Ladies and gentlemen, those of you who were at Highland Park remember that Mr. Newman called on me unexpectedly to filibuster until he could get his program under way, and you were very sympathetic with me because of the very dastardly trick that was played on me. However I have forgiven Mr. Newman and am in a position to welcome him to the south again as he returns to Alabama from his long sojourn at Virginia. [Laughter]

I haven't come up here to pick a quarrel with "Foots" Newman, because I don't want to engage in a contest of wits with a man who is so obviously unarmed. [Laughter] But I have forgiven him for his trick last year, and its aftermath, this time.

I enjoy coming to these meetings, meeting the different people that I have known. Bob Strozier is one of the exiles from the state of Georgia who is out among other lands, and I enjoy coming to these meetings and rooming with him.

Down in the quiet section of south Georgia, there is a little town called McRae. None of you have ever heard of it. They tell the story that in Spain there is a certain section of that country where the wildest bulls come from, and no matter what sort of bull it is, if it comes from that section it fights well. Well the only two people that you will ever hear of that were born in McRae, Georgia, were Governor Eugene Talmadge and Bob Strozier. [Laughter] They both have been crusaders and we are

all very proud of the way Bob has stood for the administrative integrity of the dean of students' office. Bob is trying to remain a southerner as hard as he can, and I have been helping him. [Laughter] Every year I work up with him a list of southern people who are attending the University of Chicago, and just before Bob makes a trip into this section he makes a point of interviewing a lot of those people and re-establishing his southern brogue [laughter] so that he won't be a stranger among us. [Laughter]

Tonight we have some speeches. The first man I want to introduce is president of the local University, a historian, who taught once at the University of South Carolina and at Princeton, married a southern girl from South Carolina, was dean at Vanderbilt, and of course the president of this colorful institution.

I haven't any advice to offer him about his finances, except this. He told us the other night that the college still had some Confederate bonds. Well, that is more hopeful than he might think. I don't want him to get too discouraged about those because I have high hopes for their ultimate value. [Laughter]

Also I was told that he was a southerner. Well, that is utterly untrue. [Laughter] The other night, in welcoming us to Williamsburg, he said that he wanted all of us to visit the old campus. Well any man who says "all of us" is not a southerner. [Laughter] The language of Lee and Jackson has been corrupted by the grammar of Horace and Vergil. [Laughter] He did not stand that test.

Tonight he says he has no subject. He wants to talk to us and we want him to officially say that we deans have behaved ourselves here, equally as well as, say, an American Legionnaire. [Laughter] So we would like to get from you, President Pomfret, at least that much commendation, please. [Laughter and applause]

MR. JOHN E. POMFRET (President, College of William and Mary): Ladies and gentlemen: The Reverend has made me feel slightly undressed. [Laughter] In fact I feel almost naked after that introduction.

The other evening I spoke to you as if you were tourists. This evening I am going to talk to you as deans, just for five minutes.

You haven't solved any problems. I know that. My only hope is that you are rested. [Laughter] That is very important. I once heard the wife of a college president say to him, rather wearily, "Do we have to solve the fraternity problem every year?" [Laughter]

I suspect that is about the way deans feel about these problems that they tell their presidents they are setting forth to solve at these meetings.

Now the occupation of dean has changed a little bit since my day. I was trained under the hard school of Christian Gauss, one of your old protectors here. Fifteen years ago the occupation was easy. I would get hold of a bunch of inebriates and I would say, "Gentlemen, you had a nice party. Now you can all go home until the university sends for you." And they would say, "Yes." But now we have a New Deal in Deaning, [Laughter] a New Deal relationship in Deaning, where the students, when a regulation has been violated, call upon the dean first to defend the regulation. [Laughter] The second aspect of the New Deal for Deans is that when you have made your decision, that, gentlemen, is just the beginning. [Laughter] Every decision is now subject to a debate, and in some places the debate goes not only to the campus newspaper but to the daily press, and on occasion to the legislature.

Thirdly -- and this is another aspect of the change in the profession -- the student government in all its power and its majesty periodically informs the deans and the faculty how the institution should be run.

Now then, if you do not pay heed to the various injunctions there are certain accusations that are made against you. First, you have "infringed the right of the individual." Secondly, you will have "infringed the collective right of the student body." And just to make you feel really happy, you will be accused of having "infringed the great freedoms of the American people," to-wit, freedom of speech and freedom of expression.

And so the horizons of deans have been extended in recent years. It used to be a very homely occupation, confined almost completely to the campus; but in recent years the deans have become public figures.

In conclusion, you pay a high price striving to achieve a balance between freedom on the one hand and responsibility on the other, and that is the only *modus operandi* in a true democracy. So in conclusion, let me conclude as I began. I hope you have rested, and rest assured that the eternal struggle of converting adolescence to manhood will go on long after you have been kicked upstairs to the presidency.

I thank you. [Laughter and applause]

TOASTMASTER TATE: We will have some more selections by

the singers now.

... Further selections by the Colonial Williamsburg Quintet ...

TOASTMASTER TATE: I notice when those darkies started singing they got to talking about the Baptist church. We were kicked out of the Baptist church in my home town and I have been a little sensitive to that ever since. Sometimes I get sensitive to different things. For instance, the president mentioned all the trials and tribulations of the dean. He didn't mention the fact that every time you decide a disciplinary case today you have to be interviewed by the psychiatrist, and the culprit does too, and I know a dean who swears that the psychiatrist came to his campus, interviewed him, forgot to interview the culprit concerned and recommended that the suspension stand. [Laughter]

Also I am conscious of the fact that as a dean I am no longer a minority on any campus, but I am rapidly becoming a majority of the faculty.

The word dean, of course, comes from the Latin word "decanus" which means a leader of ten, and I suppose it ought to really be translated "corporal." [Laughter]

When we get on our dignity, remember that we were corporals in the Roman Army anyhow, whatever we may be today.

I have been interested too, as I came at times to these conferences, that there have been so many Tates. There are two here besides me now, and they were at Highland Park. I came up here very kindly disposed to show that we might be kin, and was a little humiliated to find that both of them had brief cases stacked with the fact that we couldn't be kin at all. [Laughter]

But we were kicked out of the Baptist church once. It is sort of a misunderstanding on the part of the Baptists. [Laughter] But they have always been very popular down in Georgia, and very numerous. I notice one of the darkies mentioned being a Presbyterian tonight. If we ever run across a darkie in Georgia who is a Presbyterian we know that somebody has been interfering with his real religion. [Laughter]

My grandfather in north Georgia was a merchant. He went down to Atlanta one summer day and bought the fall goods. He had on the only suit he had, a hot winter suit. He didn't used to wear a collar and tie, but he had to put one on then because he was going to the city. The shoes hurt his feet. He got tired and hot and went to the Kimball House there in Atlanta,

found some beer there with ice all around it. He drank a little of it -- cool, nice. And he got on that little train that goes from Atlanta up to Jasper, Georgia, and he had had so much beer he wanted to help run the engine [laughter] or help the conductor take up tickets. But the family finally got him off the train, after about ten or fifteen minutes delay--all of his sons and everybody went in there and just toted the old man off. [Laughter] About a month later they tried him, those Baptists did. [Laughter] They tried him in church for his membership. He went in and told how he had suffered, how hot he was and how cool and nice that beer looked, with all the ice around it. They let him go outdoors and sit under the tree, and if you don't believe the story, the church is still there with the tree. [Laughter] He stayed out awhile and the Baptist congregation deliberated, and after a while they called him back in and they said, "Now, Brother Tate, we love you. You have been raised in this community with us. You have eaten watermellons with us, you have hunted possum, you have been to weddings and funerals with our families, and we are going to forgive you for getting drunk. The Bible speaks of that. But," they said, "you stood here a while ago in the Lord's house and told us about ice in Atlanta in August, when we Baptists know there ain't no ice in the summer time, and we are going to kick you out of the church for lying." [Laughter]

That same grandfather has been some embarrassment to me otherwise. [Laughter] He was wounded in the Battle of Gettysburg and a bullet went in his mouth and hit his jaw teeth, and glanced out of his cheek. It didn't hit his lips, which obviously proved that my family for a long time have kept their mouths open. [Laughter] Anyway it proves my honest descent through my grandmother and my mother. [Laughter] But it also has good points. If he had had his mouth shut, his front teeth might have been shot out. [Laughter]

Of course, we deal a good deal in politics in Georgia--religion too. Mr. Strozier's fellow citizen from McRae and his son, of course, have put us in politics. We had two Governors down there you remember. We get in the newspapers. I understand we got in them this afternoon because one of our people who made the newspapers Christmas made it again this afternoon. But that is part of a dean's life. You didn't mention that. We had an open session on deans and their wives in that university until about Christmas one time. [Laughter]

But religion is pretty important down there. Sometimes religion and dogs get mixed up. [Laughter] We live out in the country on a big farm, and my mother used to keep a shepherd dog for a Jewish family, a "Collie" dog they called it. We call him

"shepherd," but social people, society people and city people call him a "collie." [Laughter] If you want to really be sort of country-fied, you can call it a shepherd dog. Shepherd dog or collie, whatever it was, it was a beautiful dog, a fine nice nose, thin sharp ears, tawny main, sort of like a tiger or lion. Every summer when this Jewish family went up to visit their kin people, they would bring that dog to stay with my mother. He would hang around on the farm and go everywhere my mother did. It was a gentle sort of dog and beautiful.

I used to be very puzzled when that dog used to go to the Methodist church with my mother on Sunday. He would sit down in the aisle. Nobody was very much concerned and didn't bother about this beautiful dog called "Frisco." If you don't believe the story, his descendants are still living in the same county. [Laughter]

Dogs, as I said, get mixed up with religion, but this dog never did. That dog would go very quietly to the Methodist church every Sunday, sit down outside of my mother's pew, and listen. If the text came from the Old Testament, he would stay there and listen just as carefully as he could, but if it came from the New Testament he would get up and go home and lie on the porch until we got back. [Laughter]

It's sort of funny how those negro stories bring all that up, about those true stories happening down there, but as I say, we get interested in religion, politics and everything else.

Somebody said I ought to tell how my other grandfather became a captain in the Confederate Army. Well, we have all been ashamed of it. It is sort of a bad story. [Laughter] It was on account of a cow. [Laughter] You know, there are not many Confederate Privates; they are all Generals. [Laughter] I came from a town of 350 people. They used to have Confederate Memorial Day, and I was always proud of my community. We sent fifteen men to the Civil War and when I knew them there were seven Colonels and eight Majors on the platform.

But my grandfather Ferguson was a soldier, and a Private. He got up here in these Virginia hills and was fighting. He was charging across the field and they shot at him and he, in the Confederate line, hit the dirt. Well, there had been a cow in that pasture. [Laughter] My grandfather forgot all of his animosity to the Yankees and he forgot all about southern chivalry, and he had the simple anxiety to wash his face. [Laughter] He made his way the best he could to a stream that happened to be in the direction of the enemy. When he staggered, after the best

fashion he could, toward the Yankee lines the rest of the Confederate line followed him, ran the Yankees back, and the next day he was commended by the Commanding Officer for his heroism, promoted to Captain on the Field of Battle. [Laughter] We have always been a bit humiliated that the only officer in the family should have been really promoted because of a cow. [Laughter]

The next speaker who is going to take a less serious vein than I have been taking [laughter] -- well, the biscuit story is another true story. Of course I limit myself to the truth. [Laughter] That is a characteristic of mine. The biscuit story also happened like these other stories. I don't think a man ought to exaggerate, oughtn't to lie, oughtn't even to make up statistics. [Laughter]

My mother had a cook who had been with us for years, and she decided she would get married. When she left us, Mamie Dee took over the kitchen. Mamie Dee had never cooked. She was about six feet, skinny, dark -- good field hand. [Laughter] But she took over and the first morning she cooked, she brought in the breakfast. It wasn't anything like this breakfast you all showed in the reel here the other day, and the biscuits were particularly bad, just as if someone had cut out a little circle of blotting paper and pitched it in a skillet and fried it for a while. Every southern woman, of course, is proud of her biscuits. Mama began to commiserate with Mamie Dee on this and that. She said, "Did you put soda in? Did you knead the dough?" and did you do this? Mamie Dee said, "Yesum, I did that." Mama said, "Well, Mamie Dee, I am not much of a cook but I can teach you to be one, and the only way we can learn to cook is to work at it. Every time you do something that isn't right, I am going to tell you and then we will try to do better next time. Now something went wrong with the biscuits this morning, and I want you to tell me what you think it is."

Mamie Dee was leaning up against the door post with her hands sort of folded up under her apron -- tall negro girl, sort of slouching over. She said, "I jus' doan know. Them biscuits squat before they raised and they cooked on the squat." [Laughter]

As I say, the next speaker will be a little less serious than I have tried to be. Instead of talking about the Civil War, he may take up one of these new wars. You know, we don't speak of but one war down where I am. [Laughter] When you say "the war," you mean the war of 1861. These others have been skirmishes between strangers as far as we are concerned. [Laughter] This man is going to speak on nuclear physics or something like that. [Laughter]

I carried Uncle Tom Reed, who is the old registrar over at the University of Georgia, down to see an exhibit of weapons for World War II. They had machine guns, mortars, bazookas and everything like that. Uncle Tom is about eighty years old, emeritus registrar, and he and I looked at them, watched the boys in their new uniforms with all these weapons, fighting back and forth down there for the exhibit of the civilian population. Uncle Tom watched them and I got ready to go back and I said, "Uncle Tom, what do you think of them?" He shook his head right slowly and said, "Oh, I wish to God Lee would have had just one of them at Gettysburg." [Laughter]

The gentleman who is going to speak to you next is quite distinguished in the procedure that may blow us all to smithereens. [Laughter] But they say there is one great advantage of it -- you will never know what hit you, and you won't have too much time to philosophize or worry.

In addition to a distinguished undergraduate career in physics and chemistry, finally combined in physical chemistry, he is Vice President today of Duke University, particularly interested in the educational program there, supervising it and working with the physical chemistry department. He was scientific adviser to the 1949 Paris UNESCO Conference, and he is president of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, relative to the atomic bomb.

I present to you Doctor Paul M. Gross of Duke University. [Applause]

DOCTOR PAUL M. GROSS (Vice President, Duke University; President, Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies; Scientific Adviser to 1949 Paris UNESCO Conference): Dean Tate and members: I thought for a moment it was the National Organization of Deans and So Forth, no damn, but it isn't. It's something else. [Laughter]

Dean Tate, I don't see at all why we had to bring displaced scholars like myself down from the north, when they have people like you down here, [Laughter] to participate in these programs. I don't see why the committee on arrangements ever asked me to talk when they had Dean Tate here.

But I promised to come, so I will tell you what I was going to say, and it didn't concern quite as closely as our Toastmaster indicated the atomic bomb. I was going to talk on some trends in higher education, and to be a little more careful, I will say I am going to comment on some trends in higher education as I have seen it and experienced it.

To do that I would like to set the stage just a little bit, if I may, and go back to the days when I was a shavetail lieutenant in World War I in the Chemical Warfare Service. I had just gotten out of college, and in those days the college and the university, as you will all recall, still partook of the flavor of the ivory tower.

World War I and its aftermath saw the emergence of the university as a real and functioning part of national life, beyond its historic function of training and education. I think the most significant trend that I know of that has gone on since that first World War has been the continuing development of that trend which has placed the college and the university directly in the picture as far as our whole national life is concerned.

This goes much deeper than some of you may realize. In those same years the picture on the college campus was quite different, and here I speak in terms of what President Pomfret referred to as the time when there was a Gaussian distribution of deans. That no longer is true.

The activities on the campus and the place of the college and the university were centered around the campus and around scholarship and study, the library and the laboratories. We had very few national youth organizations. We had very few trips to plants -- some of the engineers, yes. We had very little consultation by city officials with students, when the students took over the city and ran it for a day. We had quite a different picture.

We also -- and this is important for what I want to say later -- had a very different picture financially. I think the change that has taken place is quite significant. In my own institution, then Trinity College, in those days the student who came to Trinity College and later to Duke University paid perhaps twenty-five per cent of the cost of his education if he was an undergraduate. Today he pays somewhat more than fifty per cent. I have just made a trip in recent weeks through a number of colleges in the south and several of us together asked the question as to what contribution the student makes toward the cost of his education; and if you look up statistics on it, you will find that increasingly a larger and larger share of the cost of education comes from the students' fees. In my eyes that is a very unhappy situation, one I don't think we can do very much about, but nevertheless it is one we should guard against because it means that increasingly all of us in higher education will be in the competitive race for students, and if there is any one thing that can hurt higher education and damage it, in my judgment it will be begging the students to come to college. That is a very

serious thing and one which I think we all realize is here, although we don't always realize its implications.

The period between the two wars -- the inflation and the depression that followed -- brought home even more vividly this particular matter that I spoke of, of the college and the university becoming a more integral part of national life. It was typified by the New Deal and the New Dealists. They had their faults and they did some good, we would all have to admit. But the pattern persists today and in my judgment is here to stay.

Those of you who are in the humanities and in less measure in the social sciences perhaps don't realize, as some of us do in the scientific field, how vital a part universities play today in the whole picture of organized scholarship and research.

For example, the atomic energy Commission does very little work in its own laboratories. There are some national laboratories, but the active, forward looking programs are by and large carried on by contract with universities. Now of course that has serious implications, which we have all heard about. These implications strike deep at the thing we have all cherishingly guarded -- freedom in the colleges and in the universities. This is the kind of problem which I am afraid we are going to have to face increasingly, as time goes on, and as state and national government support for education in various forms increases as the years go on.

We have heard about the Baptists tonight. Recently in my state there was a very active discussion and controversy as to whether or not support of a hospital for one of our institutions should be accepted from state funds, as the denomination felt that it raised the whole question of church and state. There again, however, I think our position is a little illogical because if any of you in your institutions have any kind of a government contract, you have already taken the first step toward the integration of church and state. And if you haven't read the contract carefully, as I have, as deans, you will be surprised when you read it as to what you have agreed to do.

Now this is not a bad thing unless it gets in bad hands. Much of the requirement, the control and the statement about what can and cannot be done is pure paper and pure lip service. So it is not a serious thing as it is handled today under agencies, for example, like the U. S. Public Health, the Atomic Energy Commission itself, the Office of Naval Research. It is obvious to all of us that the scale of some of these activities is such that it will not be possible without federal support to carry them forward

and to support them in our institutions. They are here to stay in my judgment, and we should make the best of them and mold them to our design and our purposes, rather than oppose them.

That is one trend I wanted to talk about very briefly. Let me turn to another one.

You have all heard, participated in, read and argued about the whole matter of preparation of college teachers. I happened to room with Dean Blegen at a conference at Iowa recently, just prior to the time that he planned the Chicago conference on this topic. Dean Blegen is a historian, dean of the Graduate School at the University of Minnesota, and an outstanding one. He is typical of many of our professors and our scholars in these fields of scholarship and learning who realize that there is a middle ground between the view of those on the side of education who wish to emphasize methodology in teaching (the details of preparation for teaching), and those who say that content material is the basic thing.

I think it is rather unfortunate that this has not been more carefully documented, and here I speak as the dean of a graduate school. In a good department at the graduate level there is an amazing amount that is done to attempt to prepare a man for a teaching career. True, it needs to be done better, followed through more, and worked out and organized in much better fashion than it has been, but the gap between these two extremes is by no means as great as the controversy which rages currently would indicate. We have much to learn, those of us who are interested in the content side, from those who have done wonders at the elementary high school level with the methods of teaching, and we can benefit by them.

Having said that, I won't go very much further for this reason: I was asked to serve as Scientific Delegate to the State Department at the last UNESCO conference in Paris. As your Toastmaster said, I am a physical chemist. I have worked in the laboratory. I have attended international scientific meetings fairly frequently, but I had never attended an international meeting such as the UNESCO meeting. It was quite an experience to me and one that has some long range implications, at least in my thinking, and I would like to tell you just a little about them.

UNESCO is the peace arm of the United Nations Organization. There is more good will, more optimism, more faith in what we can do for peace in those interested in UNESCO -- in the U. S. Commission for UNESCO and in the organization itself -- than I have ever seen anywhere. But when I think of its operation

in the Conference and think of its problems and the way people went about them, I think it has a real lesson and a real meaning to us.

I remember, for example, that we had fifty delegates, each with a vote. We had one vote, the United Kingdom had one vote, Pakistan had one vote, Monaco had one vote; and when you think of the democratic process as you saw it operate there, there is tremendous room for us, its proponents, to find a way to make it work on a world scale.

I recall, for example, the representative from Pakistan. During the first four or five days of the conference, although he was very vocal in private conversation -- he happened to be assigned to me as one of the liaison responsibilities for the U. S. delegation -- he never said a word in the conference. About the fifth day the topic of fundamental education came up for discussion. It had been discussed in the three or four days preceding. Suddenly he got up and made a very impassioned and lengthy speech.

Let me tell you that he has an M.A. in the subject of fundamental education from Ohio State University. Well, that was a minor mystery to me, why he had kept quiet so long, until I found out that only the preceding evening had the contribution from Pakistan come into UNESCO, its annual financial contribution. On any mention of fundamental education this man would rise and make a ten or fifteen minute speech, if the chairman couldn't get him to sit down. He was sincere. He followed the guidance of French strategy in colonial affairs, which was to say that the way to build up these backward areas was by a logical process. "We will teach the fundamentals from the first grades up. We will then put in technical education, and then high school, college and university education. And out of that there will arise a better economic level, greater prosperity and more general well-being for the particular backward area." Well, those of us who have been in the south, I think, know this much, that we won't lift our educational sights and levels higher until we have financial support from states, from foundations, from towns, counties and cities to pay for it.

This man was very sincere and yet I doubt if anything much will be done for Pakistan by that route. I personally would much rather see Truman's Point 4 operate, and let us go in and investigate the water power there, let us see what resources there are, and let us attempt to build an economic background on which an educational system can be built and paid for.

Sometimes this comes right home. We are in the south, and I would like to put in a peg for it while we are here. Some

of you may have read a very critical article in the "Reader's Digest" some years ago, maybe last year, by Embree, formerly of the Rockefeller Foundation, of foundation operations, and in it he brought out as one of his points the proposition that the south needed one great university. That was very startling to some people; but to those of us who are here in the south, it showed a very definite lack of perspective and point of view. What reason is there to believe that one great university can serve the populations, in the geographic area properly, of the states from the Atlantic Seaboard to Texas and Oklahoma? One might just as well have said that Yale, Columbia and Harvard could take care of the educational leadership of the middle west, and there would have been no reason for founding the University of Chicago, that would have been unnecessary entirely.

So we have a problem here, which I have just touched on very briefly, in relation to this other one.

Coming back to UNESCO, I was impressed very forcibly with the problem which we as educators, I think, should face up to, and that is the very real and difficult problem of communication. We have had much debate about the place of foreign languages in the curriculum. Should it be there or shouldn't it? Should we encourage the teaching of it? Is it not enough to read the literature and translation and to discuss the civilization? Well, my limited contact with that tells me very clearly that that is not enough. We need to have the tools of communication, and we need them very badly because in one or two committee meetings the differences of opinion which arose out of language misunderstanding and consumed an hour or an hour and a half to clear up, with good interpreters, would have amazed you if you had been there, as they did me.

This is no small problem, and it is one which those of us who believe in a world federation have got to face. World federalism and its ideals and objectives are certainly high ones, but the practical, intermediate, down-to-earth steps about reaching community with other peoples is a very, very difficult one.

Coming back to UNESCO itself, which is the educational organization, as well as the scientific and cultural organization, as you know, of the United Nations, has a budget about as big as the budget of Duke University -- some seven or eight million dollars. If you look at its budget program and see what it is trying to do on global and functional fronts, you will realize the enormous gap between this world idealism and practical accomplishment of any kind of common policy between two nations which are not closely together by language and racial ties. It is a tremendously serious problem. They are trying to educate

the world, the backward areas, they are trying to disseminate scientific information and knowledge, and they are trying to do it with eight million dollars; and they have good people doing it, I must say that for them.

But this kind of a problem I think comes home to us here in our own colleges and universities. We have, I feel, as of course the historians and some of the economists and the political scientists have long known, a great obligation to train our students so that they will at least be receptive on the international level; and in my judgment one of the best ways to do it is through language training as well as the other types of training that we know of.

This barrier to language brings back a story to my mind about language and communication which is told at Los Alamos. It seems that about two weeks prior to the date on which the first bomb was dropped, or rather was set off at Alamogordo, on a tour there was an old Indian chief who had the habit of going off to communicate with himself and do a little hunting and fishing on his own, without the whole tribe about his ears, and he would just disappear. About ten days later he would let them know where he was. So, as I say, just prior to this first explosion the Indian chief went off on his hunting trip, and he had a wonderful time away from all the tribe and all the problems of administration and similar things that he had to deal with. About ten days had gone by and he thought, well maybe he ought to let them know at home where he was, and keep in touch with them. So about dawn one morning he woke up and remembered this, and thought that he had better get busy, so he built a fire, a very big one. He felt very happy and wanted to talk to people back home, and when it was burning briskly he threw some green weeds on it and then he took his blanket and he sent up the most marvelous series of smoke language signals that had been communicated for some time. It was very eloquent. Then he sat back on a rock and waited for the answer, because the tribe was supposed to watch and see. Within about a minute or two there burst forth a fire as brilliant as the sun, and following it were tumultuous clouds, and outpouring, a huge pillar of smoke which mushroomed out at the top and curled and showed variegated color. He just sat back and his jaw dropped, and he grunted in Indian fashion and said, "I wish I'd said that." [Laughter]

Let me talk of one other trend that I think may be of interest. When I first went to Trinity College as an instructor in chemistry, which later as you know became Duke University, there wasn't any talk of an integration of research and teaching. In fact, there were good researchers and good teachers and very rarely did the twain mix. The pre-war period and the war itself

in my judgment have completely changed that picture. There were other reasons for changing it -- good common sense, among them.

I just returned last week from a trip through a number of colleges in the south which have participated in this experiment of the Carnegie Foundation, which is called a "Project for the Improvement of Teaching," and that is what we all have to worry about, according to everybody, as deans. This has been running for four years, and the colleges are small, medium and large. I have been in university research and in government research for many years and I am frank to say in the first year I had my tongue in my cheek about what might happen if substantial sums of money, relatively so at least, were made available at the college level, for encouragement of good teaching through research. I wish you could have been with me and seen the results, in published form and in many other forms, of this four-year program in these colleges, and this is typical of a number of other colleges throughout the south. If there is one trend that I am glad to see it is that away from the separation of teaching from research and scholarship at all levels. I feel that this is one of the best signs of our educational times.

I don't know how many of you know of the so-called Trenton report of the National Research Council, which was issued some years ago, which was a study of the origins of doctorates in the sciences, in terms of the institutions at which those holders of the Ph.D. received their baccalaureate. To me that was a very revealing study and one of great significance for the country, and for the long run in terms of scholarship and research. It showed, not as I thought and others thought, that the stimulus to go on with scholarly work and research, at least in the sciences, did not come as was to be expected perhaps from universities like my own where relatively few of our students went on in chemistry to the Doctor's degree; it showed there were several colleges -- Reed College in Oregon, another college in Mississippi -- which had a phenomenal record of encouraging students to go on to the Doctor's degree in certain of the scientific disciplines. And when that was tracked down, it was found to be associated clearly and definitely as a causal matter to the presence of one or two men and their inspiration to carry on.

I was a member of the Navy's panel for the chemical potential of the country, and one of the problems was, where do we find more inorganic chemists? Where do we find this, that and the other thing for these laboratories, for agriculture, for the Atomic Energy Commission, and so on? And there was quite an argument about where talent and genius might originate. I maintained, and I maintain today, that talent and genius are functions only of the total population, but whether they be realized and

matured and developed as outstanding investigators and scholars is a very different function. It is a function of the small colleges and of college education under inspired leadership of teachers in the college.

That brings me to the last thing I would like to say in this whole general area. I have thought a good deal about the development of the atomic energy program, and it has been my business to, to the extent that I have been concerned with it. And one of the problems that it is facing, as was revealed by the Fuchs case, is the finding of men of high intellectual ability, who at the same time have integrity in our national interest. There was good reason why men like Fuchs were brought into the program. The reason was the number available here under our system of education was limited.

You could not anywhere in the world, in Europe or in England, find a gathering of deans of men such as yours is here tonight. This is unique. You are concerned with the individual student, his activities, his organizations, advice to him, and so on. There is no parallel to such an organization as this. This is a product of American genius and operation, and it has no parallel educationally that I know of.

On the other hand, the European systems that I have known have had their merit. Although they allowed the average individual to fight his own way, work as best he could, and somehow come through, they have seen to it and made it their business that the gifted individual in terms of natural endowment and talents was lifted from the mass and everything possible done for him.

Now many times, as I think was the case in the Fuchs incident, that has spoiled him; but other times it has developed-- at least in certain scientific realms and I am sure those of you who are familiar with your own disciplines could supply examples from those as well -- it has caused the emergence under favorable conditions of really talented men, and occasionally of men of genius.

This country, at least scientifically and I would venture to guess maybe in other directions though I don't speak there with any authority, has got to find a way to provide more adequately for the development and encouragement of its ablest students so that they can emerge as highly trained and specialized individuals in these fields that are of great and vital interest to the nation.

So while we are discussing and you are discussing, as I

looked over your program, problems of organization and problems of the individual, those of you who are in guidance, let us not forget that there are classic, hereditary and traditional background problems in this development which we have got to encourage and encourage as fully as possible. In other words, I think, if I may dare to say so to an organization like yours, we must keep perspective on the background of scholarship which we hope we will apply on our genius of organization in this country.

I am reminded of another story, if I may dare tell it with my wife present. She has heard it often. This story is about the Captain's parrot on the convoy. This is about a USO entertainer who was asked at very short notice -- he had been in administration too, and he had gotten his hand out slightly. He was asked at very short notice to sail on a crowded ship in a convoy and to do some entertaining and some slight of hand. So he got on the ship and the first day he went to the Captain and said, "Captain, I have been very busy organizing things, and I am really out of practice. Your entertainment is coming a couple of days from now. Is there any place on the ship that I can be quiet and private and practice up a little bit?"

"Well," the Captain thought a minute and he said, "we are very crowded. I don't know where you can go. There are four or five men in a room and everything is crowded." And then he thought, "Oh yes, you can have my cabin. I will be on the bridge most of the time and there is no one there but my parrot. The parrot will bother you perhaps. He swears a lot and has a lot to say. He is very talkative, but you try it anyway."

So the magician went in the Captain's cabin, and the parrot was chained to his perch, and he proceeded to practice his slight of hand tricks, and he was a little surprised that the parrot, instead of saying a word, just stared very intently at him and watched his every motion. Well, several days later the night of the entertainment came, and they assembled in the ship's dining room, much like this, and of course the parrot had to come along and be up on the platform as a privileged character. The Captain introduced the magician, and he started his parade of tricks. He was just going through the first slight of hand trick in which, while talking to his left hand, he was manipulating with his right hand, and the essence of the trick was being done over here, and right at the crucial moment, when everyone was supposed to have their attention directed here, the parrot screamed out, "Watch the right hand! Watch the right hand!" [Laughter]

Well, of course it disconcerted the magician but he went on to the next trick. It so happened that that was a palm trick

that involved palming something in his left hand, and again he was trying to distract attention, this time with his right hand. Sure enough, just at the critical moment, the parrot piped up, "Watch his left hand, watch his left hand." And the trick was spoiled.

About that time the ship was torpedoed. It was a calm night and the next morning found the parrot, the magician and the Captain on the same raft. It was a calm sea and they were waiting to be rescued. So they drifted all day, and the Captain said to the magician, "I just can't understand it. The parrot usually has a lot to say, but he is not doing a thing but staring at you. I don't know what is the matter."

Finally it got along to be sundown, and they looked at the parrot and they noticed that he was beginning to ruffle his feathers a little and sort of look around, and the Captain said, "I think he is going to say something." The parrot looked very intently at the magician and then he said, "All right, all right, I give up. Where the hell is the ship?" [Laughter]

Let us not, as educators, forget our perspective. Let us keep our eye on the training of scholars and research workers because if I am any judge we are going to need them as well as we need good all-round citizens. This country is going to need them in every effort it does, and it is going to need them to keep the competitive race in the world. [Applause]

... President Neidlinger resumed the Chair ...

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Ladies and gentlemen, we are certainly very much indebted to President Pomfret and Dr. Gross for coming and speaking with us tonight. I hate to bring this very festive occasion, and happy one, to a close, and I don't see any reason why I need to. I am a retired president of this organization. When it comes to making nasty decisions, I can at least turn to the new president and make it his responsibility.

President Lloyd, with your permission, we will adjourn.

PRESIDENT-ELECT LLOYD: Permission granted.

PRESIDENT NEIDLINGER: Thank you very much. [Applause]

... The meeting adjourned at ten-twenty o'clock ...

APPENDIX AREPORT OF THE SECRETARY

April 1, 1949 to March 1, 1950

To the Members of the National Association
of Deans and Advisers of Men:

Your Secretary is pleased to present the report of the Secretary of the Association (to which is appended the report of the Treasurer), concerning the activities of the officers, the Executive Committee, and the members for the period from April 1, 1949 to March 1, 1950.

Membership in the Association

The membership in 1949-50 stands at an all time high, the fourth consecutive year that such a report has been made. The membership has grown as follows during this period:

1947	-	130 members
1948	-	151 members
1949	-	171 members
1950	-	184 members

Deaths of Members

Your Secretary regrets to report the death of Dean Emeritus Edward E. Nicholson, of the University of Minnesota, who died in Minneapolis on June 28, 1949. Dean Nicholson was one of the founders of this Association, having attended the initial meeting at Madison, Wisconsin, in 1919. He served as President of the Association in 1921-22 and as Secretary from 1922-24.

Loss of One Member Institution

Following the resignation of Dean Earl L. Miller as Dean at the University of California at Los Angeles, his successor Dean Milton E. Hahn, recommended to his institution that based on the action of the Executive Committee and the Conference in 1949 concerning the payment of dues for degree granting branches of institutions, the membership for his institution be discontinued.

New Members of the Association

Fourteen new member institutions with designated representatives have been reported through the News Letter. These have included two teachers' colleges, seven private colleges and universities, and five state universities. Noteworthy among these.

were the University of Puerto Rico and the University of Alaska.

Retirement of Members

Dean Arthur Ray Warnock of Pennsylvania State College retired in September 1949, having served as Dean of Men at Pennsylvania State College since 1922.

Appointments and Promotions

In the course of the year, there have been reported numerous promotions and new appointments of members. Twenty of these have been especially noteworthy, and have included promotions to 3 presidencies, 1 Acting President, 1 Provost, 2 Vice Presidents, 1 Dean of Administration, and 1 to a Specialist's position in the United States Office of Education. The trend to promote former Deans of Men to the more general administrative position of Dean of Students seems to continue.

Representatives at Meetings

While we are sure this list is incomplete, there have been reported to the membership, representation of the Association at numerous conferences and meetings. These have included 15 national meetings, 5 regional meetings, 8 state conferences, and 5 special workshops. The national meetings have included representation at several conferences called by the American Council on Education, the National Board of Foreign Scholarships, and UNESCO. We have also been invited to send representatives to 5 presidential inaugurations during the period.

Questionable Projects Reported

Six questionable projects and rackets have been reported through the News Letters. It is interesting to note that one crook working a racket in the midwest was apprehended by officers of the law cooperating with two Deans, within a week after the notice was published in the News Letter.

Publications

Due to editorial delays, the 1949 Proceedings have not yet been distributed to the members. Your Editor hopes to have these in your hands in the near future. The basic reason for the delay has been the necessity of cutting the material to a size which we can afford to publish at present prices, without loss of meaning and content.

Eleven regular and extra News Letters have been prepared and forwarded to members during the period. Appendices of seemingly helpful material have been included with the News Letters.

103 publications have been reviewed briefly, and several have been secured and forwarded to members.

The Placement Service of the Association

The informal placement service offered by the Association has had the following activity during the year.

	<u>Listed</u>	<u>Placed</u>	<u>Available</u>
Up to April 1, 1949	143	53	90
Registered and placed during year	44	6	
Status at March 1, 1950	187	59	128

This is less activity than was reported last year in the placement field, and a marked increase in registrations. We have had numerous requests from persons outside of member institutions seeking to use this service, and there is some question as to how far we can go in accommodating these persons.

Leaves for Additional Graduate Work

At least six of our younger members are on leave from their institutions at the present time, completing work on advanced degrees. This seems to be something of a trend. We have had scattered reports in years gone by as individuals have taken time for graduate work, but we have had no such numbers reported simultaneously as we have had this year.

Plans for the 1950 Conference

Your Secretary cannot conscientiously complete this report without mentioning the cooperation he has had from Dean L. K. Neidlinger, the Executive Committee, and Dean John E. Hocutt of the College of William and Mary in making the plans for the 1950 Conference. Plans for this Conference began at the Executive Committee meeting at Highland Park in 1949. There has been much correspondence, meetings of the officers and Executive Committee in Washington in November, and steady communication since that time. Dean L. K. Neidlinger has done a tremendous amount of work in planning the workshop type of program, and Dean Hocutt has done everything possible to plan a pleasant and comfortable conference.

The Executive Committee has tried in every instance to carry out the mandates of the 1949 Conference and the opinions of the members during the year.

Inability to Schedule the 1950 Conference at Time Adjacent to the Schedule of the A.C.P.A. Meeting.

The Officers of our Association found it impossible to schedule our 1950 meeting on a week-end either just before or just after the 1950 A.C.P.A. meeting.

Final Comment

Your Secretary wishes to report that the Association is again at an all-time high in membership, status, recognition, and interest, not only from its own members but from non-members.

Respectfully submitted,

Urbana, Illinois
March 1, 1950

Fred H. Turner
Secretary

TREASURER'S REPORT

April 1, 1949 - March 1, 1950

RECEIPTS

Balance on Hand April 1, 1949	\$1,615.90
Dues Collected 1950-51	102.00
Dues Collected 1949-50	2,454.00
Dues Collected 1948-49	72.00
Receipts from Small Bibliography	3.00
Receipts from sale of Proceedings	30.00
Banquet Ticket Sales	935.00
Registration Fees	412.00
Cash Used at Conference for change	25.00
	<hr/>
	\$5,648.90

TREASURER'S REPORT (Continued)DISBURSEMENTS

Telegrams and Telephone	\$ 26.79
Stationery and Programs (also Constitutions)	165.50
Mimeographing	93.74
Stenographic Service	25.00
Reporting 1949 Convention	346.50
Membership Dues (American Council on Education)	25.00
Magazine Subscriptions and Books	19.90
Expenses -National Conference on College	
Fraternities and Societies (Park	20.56
-American Council on Education (Knapp)	42.15
-Estes Park Conference (Nowotny)	18.75
Meeting at Washington, D. C. - Time of National	
Interfraternity Conference	36.90
Printing 1948 Proceedings	986.90
Cash Used at Conference	25.00
Badges (additional)	6.27
Expenses - Highland Park Conference:	1,390.61
Speaker - Doctor Brown	\$124.87
Registration Help	20.00
Expenses incurred by Philip Sherman	5.00
Mimeographing at Highland Park	
of Reports	54.85
Banquet Tickets	940.00
Floral decorations	10.20
Typewriter Rental	6.00
Service Department and Porter	36.25
Meals of Guests	12.00
Speaker - Doctor MacIntosh	124.64
Telephone	3.99
Dean Newman's expenses	11.26
Expenses of Geraldine Saddlemire	32.60
Notebooks used at Conference	8.95
Secretary's Salary	100.00
Postage	102.68
Express	29.77
Bank Debit Deductions	4.78
Badges and Gavel for 1950 Meeting	39.07
	<hr/>
	\$3,505.07
BALANCE ON HAND MARCH 1, 1950 - \$2,143.83	

APPENDIX BOFFICIAL ROSTER OF THOSE IN ATTENDANCE AT
THE WILLIAMSBURG MEETING

<u>Name</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Title</u>
Abel, E. Glynn	Southwestern La. Institute	Dean of Men
Alderman, W. E., Jr.	Univ. of Cincinnati	Asst. Dean of Men
Allen, James G.	Texas Tech. College	Dean of Men
Alter, Foster E.	Univ. of Miami	Dean of Men
Anderson, M. A.	Hiram College	Director of Student Personnel
Bailey, John C.	Davidson College	Dean of Students
Baldwin, Frank C.	Cornell University	Dean of Men
Barnard, Chester I.	Rockefeller Found.	President
Barnes, William J.	National Interfraternity Conference	Chairman
Bates, Robert E.	Va. Polytechnic Institute	Dir. of Stu. Affairs
Bayley, Francis C.	Denison University	Dean of Men
Beaty, R. C.	Univ. of Florida	Dean of Men
Benz, Stanley C.	Purdue Univ.	Dir. of Counseling
Biddle, T. W.	U. of Pittsburgh	Dean of Men
Bishop, Robert W.	U. of Cincinnati	Dean of Men
Blaesser, Willard W.	Div. of Higher Education, Office of Education	Specialist, Student Personnel Program
Blake, Wm. H.	Catawba College	Dean of Men
Blocker, Clyde E.	Univ. of Tulsa	Counselor of Men
Blunk, W. D.	Univ. of Texas	Asst. Dean of Men
Boldt, Albert W.	Univ. of Florida	Asst. Dean of Men
Boocock, C. B.	Rutgers Univ.	Dean of Men
Bostwick, J. L.	Allegheny College	Dean of Students
Brailey, Lester G.	Univ. of Pittsburgh	Asst. Dean of Men
Bredt, C. V.	Univ. of Texas	Asst. Dean of Students Life
Brewer, Robt. G.	Florida St. Univ.	Dir. of Residence for Men
Bright, John	Col. of William and Mary	Director of Student Employment
Brooks, Charles C.	Wheaton College	Dean of Students
Brooks, Richard B.	Col. of William and Mary	Director of Counseling
Brown, George K.	St. Lawrence College	Dean of Men
Bruner, Warren	Defiance College	Director, Career Conference

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Burdin, L. Gray	Butler University	Dean of Men
Bursley, J. A.	Univ. of Michigan	Dean
Burts, Richard C.	Mercer University	Dean of Men
Camp, Charles F.	Dartmouth College	Asst. Dean of the College
Campbell, O. K.	Oklahoma A. and M.	Dean of Students
Carr, Jimmy	Florida State Univ.	Asst. Dean of Men
Carter, Edward M.	Park College	Dean of Men
Clague, W. Donald	Bridgewater College	Dean of Students
Clippinger, Frank W.	Drury College	Dean of Men
Cloyd, E. L.	N. Car. State College	Dean of Students
Congdon, Wray H.	Lehigh University	Dean of Students
Conklin, Arch B.	Bowling Green State University	Dean Students
Crosby, Howard J.	Rutgers University	Asst. Dean of Men
Crowe, S. E.	Mich. State College	Dean of Students
Damm, John A.	Stevens Institute of Technology	Assistant Dean
Daugherty, J. E.	Univ. of Delaware	Dean of Men
Davis, George E.	Purdue University	Dir. of Student Affairs
Davis, I. Clark	So. Ill. Univ.	Dean of Men
Davis, Joe E. Lt. Col.	A.&M. Col. of Texas	Asst. Commandant
Davis, John B.	Univ. of N. Hampshire	Acting Dean of Men
Deakins, C. E.	Ill. Inst. of Tech.	Dean of Students
Dean, Miles T.	Florida State Univ.	Counselor to Men
DeMarino, D. A.	Pa. State College	Asst. Dean of Men
Dickinson, J. A.	Carnegie Inst. of Technology	Dean of Men
Dunford, Ralph E.	Univ. of Tennessee	Dean of Students
Dunn, William L.	Lake Forest College	Dean of the College
Durand, Edwin M.	Rutgers University (Newark Colleges)	Dean of Students
DuShane, D. M.	Univ. of Oregon	Dir. of Student Affairs
Eaton, Paul C.	Calif. Inst. of Tech.	Associate Dean
Eppley, Geary	Univ. of Maryland	Dir. of Student Welfare
Espenshade, Eby C.	Elizabethtown Col.	Dean of Men
Etheridge, R. F.	So. Illinois Univ.	Asst. Dean of Men
Farber, Robert H.	DePauw Univ.	Asst. Dean of Students
Farrington, C. M.	Geo. Washington U.	Dean of Men's Activities
Farrisee, W. J.	Clarkson College of Technology	Dean of Men
Faunce, L. Dale	Mich. State College	Coun. for Men
Fletcher, R. R.	Univ. of Virginia	Assoc. Director of Admissions

APPENDIX B (Continued)

French, Arden O.	La. State Univ.	Dean of Men
Friday, William	Univ. of No. Car.	Asst. Dean of Students
Fulton, Dudley G.	Northwestern State Col.	Dean of Men
Galbraith, Maurice	U. of Ill. Profes- sional Colleges	Director of Student Welfare
Gardner, D. H.	University of Akron	Dean of Students
Gass, Clinton B.	Neb. Wesleyan Univ.	Dean of Men
George, W. E. C.	DePauw University	Men's Residence Halls Counselor
Gerber, Joe N.	Northwestern State College	Director of Student Personnel
Gilliam, Frank J.	Wash. & Lee Univ.	Dean of Students
Gittinger, J. Price	Univ. of California at Davis	Supervisor of Student Affairs
Gluck, Joseph C.	West Virginia Univ.	Dir., Student Affairs
Godolphin, F. R. B.	Princeton University	Dean of the College
Goodnight, S. H.	Univ. of Wisconsin	Dean of Men Emeritus
Gray, C. J.	Univ. of Richmond	Dean of Students
Griffin, Geo. C.	Ga. Inst. of Tech.	Dean of Students
Griffin, R. A.	Western Reserve Univ.	Dean of Men
Griffin, R. S.	Univ. of Nevada	Dean of Men
Guthridge, Joe W.	Va. Polytechnic Inst.	Asst. Dir. of Student Affairs
Guthrie, William A.	Ohio State University	Jr. Dean, Arts Col.
Guy, John A.	Ill. Wesleyan Univ.	Dean of Men
Haack, Arno J.	Washington Univ.	Dir. of Students
Hampton, V. J.	Univ. of Illinois	Asst. Dean of Men
Hassler, Roy D.	Moravian College	Dean
Haugen, Rolf N. B.	Univ. of Vermont	Acting Dean of Admin- istration
Hawthorne, E. L.	Alfred University	Dean of Men
Hayes, Will	Santa Barbara Col.	Dean of Men
Hazell, William	Newark Col. of Eng.	Associate Dean
Hendrix, Noble B.	Univ. of Alabama	Dean of Students
Hocutt, John E.	Col. of Wm. & Mary	Dean of Men
Holdeman, W. D.	Oberlin College	Acting Dean of Men
Holland, Jack	Univ. of Texas	Dean of Men
Hollister, Barry	Antioch College	Dean of Students
Hubbell, Garner E.	The Principia	Dean of Men
Huber, E. Burke	Univ. of Arkansas	Dir. of Housing
Hulet, Richard E.	Univ. of Illinois	Asst. Dean of Men
Hunkins, Maurel	Ohio University	Dean of Men
Hunt, Everett L.	Swarthmore College	Dean
Hunt, Frank R.	Lafayette College	Dean of Students
Hyink, Bernard	U. of So. Calif.	Dean of Students
Isen, Joe J.	Bona Fide Reporting Co.	Reporter

APPENDIX B (Continued)

James, Robert C.	Univ. of Maryland	Asst. Dean of Men
Jansen, John F.	Carroll College	Dean of Men
Jarchow, Merrill E.	Carleton College	Dean of Men
Jeffries, Ray	Univ. of No. Car.	Asst. to Dean of Students
Johns, Robert	Purdue University	Asst. to the President
Keeney, A. L.	Univ. of Wyoming	Dean of Men
Kerr, Donald C.	Cornell University	Counselor to Foreign Students
King, Tom	Mich. State College	Alumni Director
Kirwan, A. D.	Univ. of Kentucky	Dean of Men
Knapp, A. Blair	Temple University	Vice President and Dean of Students
Knox, Carl W.	University of Illinois	
Lambert, J. W.	Col. of Wm. & Mary	Dean of Students
LeMasters, E. E.	Associated Colleges of Upper New York	Dean of Students
Lloyd, Wesley P.	Brigham Young Univ.	Dean of Students
McBride, Otis	Florida State Univ.	Dean of Men
McCain, Virgil	Huntingdon College	Dean of Men
McGuigan, R. F.	Northwestern Univ.	Counselor to Men
Mallett, D. R.	Purdue University	Asst. Dir. of Student Affairs
Manchester, R. E.	Kent State University	Dean of Men
Marshall, Nelson	Col. of Wm. & Mary	Dean of the College
Marshall, W. E.	East. Car. State Teachers College	Dean of Men and Student Life
Melvin, Harold W.	Northeastern College	Dean of Students
Miner, Douglas F.	Carnegie Inst. of Tech.	Dir. of Personnel and Welfare
Miner, Robert J.	Miami University	Dir. of Student Affairs
Moore, John M.	Swarthmore College	Associate Dean
Moore, Robert	Ark. State College	Dean of Men
Musser, Malcolm E.	Bucknell University	Dean of Men
Neidlinger, L. K.	Dartmouth College	Dean of the College
Newhouse, Dean	Case Inst. of Tech.	Dean of Students
Newman, J. H.	Univ. of Alabama	Dean of Administration
North, Sidney B.	Alpha Phi Omega	National Secretary
Nowotny, Arno	Univ. of Texas	Dean of Student Life
Overholt, M. W.	Ohio State University	Housing Director

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Park, Joseph A.	Ohio State University	Dean of Men
Parks, Donald S.	University of Toledo	Director of Personnel
Peele, Edward V.	Col. of Wm. & Mary	Asst. Director
Pellett, Ray C.	Western Mich. College of Education	Dean of Men
Penberthy, W. L.	Ag. & Mech. College of Texas	Dean of Students
Pershing, J. J.	Ga. Inst. of Tech.	Assoc. Dean of Students
Pitre, T. P.	Mass. Inst. of Tech.	Dean of Freshmen
Pomfret, John E.	Col. of Wm. & Mary	President
Price, Philip	Univ. of Rochester	Director, Todd Union
Quinn, John F.	R. I. State College	Dean of Men
Rea, W. B.	Univ. of Michigan	Assoc. Dean of Students
Rece, E. H.	Emory University	Dean of Students
Reed, Norman A.	The Cooper Union	Student Relations Officer
Ricart, J. Edward	Univ. of Pittsburgh	Asst. Dean of Men
Roberts, O. D.	Univ. of Oklahoma	Counselor of Men
Rollins, J. Leslie	Harvard University	Asst. Dean, Harvard Grad. School of Bus.
Rollins, J. W.	East Texas State Teachers College	Dean of Men
Rosebush, J. G.	College of Wooster	Dean of Men
Ross, Mylin H.	Ohio State University	Asst. Dean of Men
Royal, Doyle P.	Maryland University	Asst. Dean of Men
Saviers, Eldred L.	Kent State University	Asst. to Dean of Men
Scales, James R.	Okla. Bapt. Univ.	Dean of Men
Seidle, Chas. A.	Lehigh University	Associate Dean
Sessoms, David J.	Catawba College	Director of Student Activities
Sevrinson, C. A.	N. Dak. Agric. College	Dean
Shaffer, Robt. O.	Cornell University	Asst. to Dean of Men
Shoemaker, J. E.	Univ. of Arkansas	Dean of Men
Shumway, Waldo	Stevens Institute	Dean
Shutt, Darold	Marshall College	Dean of Men
Sikir, Henry J.	Univ. of Alabama	Asst. Dean of Students
Slay, James M.	Duke University	Asst. Dean, Trinity
Somerville, J. J.	Ohio Wesleyan Univ.	Dean of Men
Spathelf, V. F.	Wayne University	Dean of Student Affairs
Stafford, E. E.	Univ. of Illinois	Dean of Men
Stewart, H. E.	Wayne University	Asst. Dean of Student Affairs
Stibbs, John H.	Tulane University	Dir. of Student Life
Stone, Hurford E.	Univ. of California	Dean of Students

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Stratton, Leon D.	Drexel Inst. of Tech.	Dean of Men
Street, George M.	Univ. of Mississippi	Asst. Dean of Men
Strozler, R. M.	University of Chicago	Dean of Students
Swanson, Carl R.	St. Olaf College	Dean of Men
Tate, E. Mowbray	Hanover College	Dean
Tate, William	Univ. of Georgia	Dean of Men
Tate, Willis M.	So. Methodist Univ.	Dean of Students
Terlescki, John	Ohio University	Asst. to the Dean and Res. Manager
Thompson, J. J.	St. Olaf College	Asst. to President
Thompson, T. J.	Univ. of Nebraska	Dean of Student Affairs
Trump, Paul L.	Univ. of Wisconsin	Dean of Men, Assoc. Dir. of Student Personnel
Trusler, V. F.	Kansas St. Teach.Col.	Dean of Men
Turner, Fred H.	Univ. of Illinois	Dean of Students
Tyler, Robert E.	Univ. of Alabama	Asst. to Dean of Students
Ungeles, Leon H.	Univ. of Missouri	Dir. of Student Affairs for Men
Van Houten, R. W.	Newark Col. of Eng.	President
Waldrop, R. S.	Vanderbilt University	Dean of Students
Walter, Erich A.	Univ. of Michigan	Dean of Students
Webb, L. W., Jr.	Col. of Wm. & Mary (Norfolk Division)	Director
Webster, E. D.	Utica College of Syracuse University	Dean of Men
Weyer, F. E.	Hastings College	Dean
White, C. G.	Texas A. & M. College	Asst. Dean of Students
Wieman, Elton E.	University of Maine	Dean of Men
Williamson, E. G.	Univ. of Minnesota	Dean of Students
Wilson, Harold K.	Penn State College	Dean of Men
Wilson, T. C., Jr.	Wash. & Lee Univ.	Asst. to Dean of Students
Wolleson, E. A.	Univ. of Illinois (Navy Pier)	Dean of Students
Wood, W. Ned	N. Car. State Col.	Asst. Dean of Students
Woodruff, L. E.	University of Kansas	Dean of Men
Wullschlager, C. W.	Ohio Wesleyan U.	Asst. Dean of Men
Yates, Geo. C.	Arizona State College	Dir. of Special Service
Zech, Albert F.	Univ. of So. Calif.	Couns. of Men
Zinn, Bennie A.	A. & M. Col. of Texas	Asst. Dean of Students

APPENDIX CROSTER OF LADIES GROUP

Alter, Miss Virginia (daughter)	Kirwan, Mrs. A. D.
Anderson, Mrs. Melvin A.	Lambert, Mrs. J. Wilfred
Angst, Mrs. William (daughter of Joseph A. Bursley)	LeMasters, Mrs. E. E.
Bates, Mrs. Robert E.	Manchester, Mrs. R. E.
Blaesser, Mrs. Willard W.	Marshall, Mrs. Nelson
Blunk, Mrs. W. D.	Miner, Mrs. Douglas F.
Bostwick, Mrs. J. L.	Moore, Mrs. John M.
Bredt, Mrs. Carl V.	Musser, Mrs. Malcolm E.
Brooks, Mrs. Richard B.	Nowotny, Mrs. Arno
Camp, Mrs. Charles F.	Park, Mrs. J. A.
Clippinger, Mrs. Frank W.	Penberthy, Mrs. W. L.
Cloyd, Mrs. E. L.	Pershing, Mrs. John J.
Congdon, Mrs. Wray H.	Price, Mrs. Philip
Crowe, Mrs. S. E.	Quinn, Mrs. John F.
Damm, Mrs. John A.	Rece, Mrs. E. H.
Daugherty, Mrs. J. Fenton	Rollins, Mrs. J. W.
Davis, Mrs. I. Clark	Rosebush, Mrs. Judson G.
Dickinson, Mrs. James A.	Ross, Mrs. Mylin H.
Dunford, Mrs. Ralph E.	Saviers, Mrs. Eldred L.
Etheridge, Mrs. Robert F.	Seidle, Mrs. Charles A.
Farrisee, Mrs. W. J.	Somerville, Mrs. J. J.
Gardner, Mrs. D. H. and two daughters	Stafford, Mrs. E. E.
Gass, Mrs. Clinton B.	Stibbs, Mrs. John H.
Gluck, Mrs. Joseph C.	Stratton, Mrs. L. D.
Goodnight, Mrs. Scott H.	Trump, Mrs. Paul L.
Guthrie, Mrs. W.S.	Trusler, Mrs. V. F.
Hocutt, Mrs. J. E.	Turner, Mrs. Fred H.
Huber, Mrs. E. Burke	Walter, Mrs. Erich A.
Hulet, Mrs. Richard E.	Webster, Mrs. E. Douglas
Hunt, Mrs. Everett	Weyer, Mrs. Frank E.
Hunt, Mrs. Frank R.	Wilson, Mrs. Harold K.
	Wood, Mrs. W. Ned

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Meet- ing	Year	Pres- ent	Place	President	Secretary
1	1919	6	Madison, Wisconsin	S. H. Goodnight	L. A. Strauss
2	1920	9	Urbana, Illinois	T. A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
3	1921	16	Iowa City, Iowa	T. A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
4	1922	20	Lexington, Kentucky	E.E. Nicholson	S.H. Goodnight
5	1923	17	Lafayette, Indiana	Stanley Coulter	E.E. Nicholson
6	1924	29	Ann Arbor, Michigan	J. A. Bursley	E.E. Nicholson
7	1925	31	Chapel Hill, N. C.	Robert Rienow	F.F. Bradshaw
8	1926	46	Minneapolis, Minnesota	C. R. Melcher	F.F. Bradshaw
9	1927	43	Atlanta, Georgia	Floyd Field	F.F. Bradshaw
10	1928	50	Boulder, Colorado	S.H. Goodnight	F.M. Dawson
11	1929	75	Washington, D. C.	G.B. Culver	V.I. Moore
12	1930	64	Fayetteville, Arkansas	J.W. Armstrong	V.I. Moore
13	1931	83	Knoxville, Tennessee	W.J. Sanders	V.I. Moore
14	1932	40	Los Angeles, California	V.I. Moore	D.H. Gardner
15	1933	55	Columbus, Ohio	C.E. Edmondson	D.H. Gardner
16	1934	61	Evanston, Illinois	H.E. Lobdell	D.H. Gardner
17	1935	56	Baton Rouge, Louisiana	B.A. Tolbert	D.H. Gardner
18	1936	92	Philadelphia, Pa.	W.E. Alderman	D.H. Gardner
19	1937	80	Austin, Texas	D.S. Lancaster	D.H. Gardner
20	1938	164	Madison, Wisconsin	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
21	1939	87	Roanoke, Virginia	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
22	1940	58	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	F.J. Findlay	F.H. Turner
23	1941	100	Cincinnati, Ohio	J.J. Thompson	F.H. Turner
24	1942	114	Urbana, Illinois	L.S. Corbett	F.H. Turner
25	1943	101	Columbus, Ohio	J.A. Park	F.H. Turner
26	1944	96	Chicago, Illinois	J.H. Julian	F.H. Turner
27	1945	Due to Office of Defense Transportation--No			Meeting Held
28	1946	142	Lafayette, Indiana	Earl J. Miller	F.H. Turner
29	1947	170	Ann Arbor, Michigan	Arno Nowotny	F.H. Turner
30	1948	173	Dallas, Texas	E.L. Cloyd	F.H. Turner
31	1949	217	Highland Park, Ill.	J.H. Newman	F.H. Turner
32	1950	210	Williamsburg, Virginia	L.K. Neidlinger	F.H. Turner

APPENDIX E
ROSTER OF MEMBERS

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Ag. & Mech. Col. of Texas	College Station, Texas	W.L. Penberthy
Akron, University of	Akron 4, Ohio	Donfred H. Gardner, Dean of Students Philip S. Sherman, Asst. Dean of Students
Alabama Polytechnic Institute	Auburn, Alabama	T.C. Clark, Jr., Director
Alabama, University of	University, Alabama	Noble B. Hendrix, Dean of Students
Alaska, University of	College, Alaska	Harry A. Brandt
Alfred University	Alfred, New York	Edward L. Hawthorne
Allegheny College	Meadville, Pennsylvania	J.L. Bostwick, Dean of Students
Anderson College and Theological Seminary	Anderson, Indiana	Horace T. Lavelly Adam W. Miller, Men's Counselor
Antioch College	Yellow Springs, Ohio	Barrett Hollister, Dean of Students
Arizona State College	Tempe, Arizona	Paul V. Trevillo
Arizona, Univ. of	Tucson, Arizona	A. Louis Slonaker
Arkansas State College	State College, Arkansas	Robert Moore, Acting Dean
Arkansas, Univ. of	Fayetteville, Arkansas	John Earl Shoemaker
Augustana College	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Jorgen S. Thompson
Baker University	Baldwin, Kansas	Benjamin A. Gessner
Beloit College	Beloit, Wisconsin	H.H. Conwell, Dean of College
Bethel College	North Newton, Kansas	Gustave E. Johnson
Bowling Green State University	Bowling Green, Ohio	Erwin E. Goering
Brown University	Providence 12, R. I.	Arch B. Conklin, Dean of Students
Bucknell University	Lewisburg, Pennsylvania	Samuel T. Arnold, Dean of the University
Butler University	Indianapolis, Indiana	Robert W. Kenny, Dean of Students
California Institute of Technology	Pasadena, California	Malcolm E. Musser L. Gray Burdin, Chair- man of Men's Council
		Franklin Thomas, Dean of Students
		Paul C. Eaton, Assoc.

APPENDIX E (Continued)

California, University of	Berkeley 4, California	H.E. Stone, Dean of Students
Capital University	Columbus, Ohio	Clyde S. Johnson Romaine Kuethe, Acting Dean
Carleton College	Northfield, Minnesota	Merrill E. Jarchow Frank R. Kille, Dean of the College
Carnegie Institute of Technology	Pittsburgh 13, Pa.	Douglas W. Miner, Director of Personnel & Welfare
Carroll College	Waukesha, Wisconsin	James A. Dickinson John Frederick Jansen Edward Voldseth, Assistant Dean
Case Institute of Technology	Cleveland, Ohio	Dean Newhouse, Dean of Students
Centre College of Kentucky	Danville, Kentucky	
Chicago, University of	Chicago 37, Illinois	Robert M. Strozier, Dean of Students
Cincinnati, Univ. of	Cincinnati 21, Ohio	Robert W. Bishop
Citadel, The	Charleston, South Car.	Colonel Prouty
Clarkson College of Technology	Potsdam, New York	W. J. Farrisee
Colgate University	Hamilton, New York	Carl A. Kallgren
Colorado College	Colorado Springs, Col.	Juan Reid
Colorado, University of	Boulder, Colorado	Clifford Houston, Dean of Students
Cooper Union, The	New York 3, New York	Harry G. Carlson
Cornell University	Ithaca, New York	Herbert F. Roemmele
Culver-Stockton College	Canton, Missouri	Frank C. Baldwin
Dartmouth College	Hanover, New Hampshire	L.L. Leftwich
Delaware, University of	Newark, Delaware	L. K. Neidlinger
Denison University	Granville, Ohio	J. Fenton Daugherty
Denver, University of	Denver 10, Colorado	Francis C. Bayley
DePaul University	Chicago, Illinois	Daniel D. Feder, Dean of Students
DePauw University	Greencastle, Indiana	T.J. Wangler
		Robert H. Farber, Asst. Dean of Students
		Lawrence A. Riggs, Dean of Students
Doane College	Crete, Nebraska	G. W. Lindberg
Drexel Institute of Technology	Philadelphia 4, Pa.	L.D. Stratton
Drury College	Springfield, Missouri	Frank W. Clippinger
East Car. State		Original from PENN STATE

APPENDIX E (Continued)

Eastern Illinois State College	Charleston, Illinois	Rudolph D. Anfinson
Elizabethtown College	Elizabethtown, Pa.	Eby C. Espenshade
Emory University	Emory University, Ga.	E. H. Rece
Florida State University	Tallahassee, Florida	J. Broward Culpepper, Dean of Student Welfare
		Otis McBride
Florida, University of	Gainesville, Florida	R.C. Beaty, Dean of Students
Fresno State College	Fresno 4, California	Forrest D. Brown, Dean of Students
George Washington University	Washington, D. C.	C.M. Farrington, Dir. of Men's Activities
Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, Georgia	George C. Griffin, Dean of Students
Georgia, University of	Athens, Georgia	William Tate
Grove City College	Grove City, Pa.	Robert E. Thorn
Hanover College	Hanover, Indiana	E. Mowbray Tate
Hastings College	Hastings, Nebraska	F. E. Weyer
Hiram College	Hiram, Ohio	Melvin A. Anderson
Idaho, University of	Moscow, Idaho	Herbert E. Lattig
Illinois Institute of Technology	Chicago 16, Illinois	Clarence E. Deakins, Dean of Students
		John F. White, Dean in Charge of Development
		R. H. Linkins
Illinois State Normal U.	Normal, Illinois	
Illinois, University of	Urbana, Illinois	Fred H. Turner, Dean of Students
Illinois Wesleyan U.	Bloomington, Illinois	John A. Guy
Indiana University	Bloomington, Indiana	R.L. Shoemaker, Dean of Students
		M.D. Helser
Iowa State College	Ames, Iowa	Walter R. Goetsch, Dean of Student Personnel Service
Iowa, The State University of	Iowa City, Iowa	Mr. Shober, Acting Academic Dean
		Victor T. Trusler
Kalamazoo College	Kalamazoo, Michigan	
Kansas State Teachers College	Emporia, Kansas	Eugene Dawson, Acting Dean of Men
Kansas State Teachers College	Pittsburg, Kansas	Paul G. Murphy, Dean of Administration
		Laurence C. Woodruff
Kansas, University of	Lawrence, Kansas	

APPENDIX E (Continued)

Kent State University	Kent, Ohio	R. E. Manchester
Kentucky, University of	Lexington 29, Kentucky	A. D. Kirwan
Lafayette College	Easton, Pennsylvania	Frank R. Hunt
Lawrence College	Appleton, Wisconsin	George Walter
Lehigh University	Bethlehem, Pa.	Wray H. Congdon, Dean of Students
Lewis & Clark College	Portland, Oregon	George W. Ennis
Louisiana State University	Baton Rouge 3, La.	Kimbrough Owen, Dir. of Student Life
Louisville, Univ. of	Louisville, Kentucky	Arden O. French
Loyola Univ. of L. A.	Los Angeles 45, Calif.	Morton Walker
Maine, University of	Orono, Maine	Frank Parrish
Marshall College	Huntington 1, W. Va.	Elton E. Wieman
Maryland, University of	College Park, Md.	Darold Shutt
Massachusetts Insti- tute of Technology	Cambridge, Mass.	Geary Eppley, Dir. of Student Welfare
Mercer University	Macon, Georgia	Everett Moore Baker, Dean of Students
Miami University	Oxford, Ohio	T. P. Pitre
		Richard C. Burts, Jr.
		Robert Miner, Dir. of Student Affairs
		W. E. Alderman, Dean of College of Arts and Science
Miami,	Coral Gables 34, Fla.	Foster E. Alter
The University of		
Michigan State College	East Lansing, Michigan	S.E. Crowe, Dean of Students
		L. Dale Faunce
Michigan,	Ann Arbor, Michigan	Erich A. Walter, Dean of Students
University of		W. B. Rea, Assoc. Dean
Minnesota,	Minneapolis 14, Minn.	E. G. Williamson, Dean of Students
University of		R. Malcolm Guess
Mississippi,	University, Miss.	
University of		
Missouri,	Columbia, Missouri	Leon H. Ungeles, Dir. of Student Affairs for Men
University of		E. Harry Beltzig, Assistant Director
Montana State College	Bozeman, Montana	Mr. H. G. Klemme
Montana State	Missoula, Montana	Herbert J. Wunderlich, Dean of Students
University		
Montclair St. Teachers	Montclair, New Jersey	Paul J. Ritter
College		

APPENDIX E (Continued)

Moravian College	Bethlehem, Pennsylvania	Roy D. Hassler
Muhlenberg College	Allentown, Pennsylvania	Sherwood R. Mercer
Nebraska,	Lincoln 8, Nebraska	T. J. Thompson, Dean
University of		of Student Affairs
Nebraska Wesleyan Univ.	Lincoln, Nebraska	Clinton B. Cass
New Hampshire,	Durham, New Hampshire	John B. Davis,
University of		Acting Dean
New Mexico, The	Albuquerque, New Mex.	Howard V. Mathany
University of		
New York University	New York, New York	William Bush Baer
Nevada, University of	Reno, Nevada	R. S. Griffin
Newark College of	Newark 2, New Jersey	William Hazell, Jr.,
Engineering		Associate Dean
North Carolina State	Raleigh, North Carolina	Ed. L. Cloyd, Dean
College		of Students
North Carolina, The	Chapel Hill, North Car.	
University of		
North Dakota Ag. Col.	Fargo, North Dakota	C. A. Sevrinson
Northeastern University	Boston 15, Mass.	Harold W. Melvin,
		Dean of Students
Northern Illinois	DeKalb, Illinois	Ernest E. Hanson
State Teachers College		James A. Meldrum
Northwestern State	Natchitoches, La.	Joe N. Gerber, Dir.
College		of Student Personnel
Northwestern	Evanston, Illinois	F. G. Seulberger,
University		Dean of Students
Oberlin College	Cherlin, Ohio	E. F. Bosworth
Ohio State University	Columbus 10, Ohio	Joseph A. Park
		William S. Guthrie,
		Jr. Dean
Ohio University	Athens, Ohio	Maurel Hunkins
		Philip L. Peterson,
		Associate Dean
Ohio Wesleyan Univ.	Delaware, Ohio	J.J. Somerville
Oklahoma A. & M. Col.	Stillwater, Oklahoma	C. H. McElroy
Oklahoma,	Norman, Oklahoma	Paul MacMinn, Dean
University of		of Students
		O.D. Roberts, Coun. of Men
Oklahoma Baptist Univ.	Shawnee, Okla.	James E. Scales
Oklahoma City Univ.	Oklahoma City, Okla.	George H. Ryden
Omaha, University of	Omaha, Nebraska	John W. Lucas, Dean
		of Students
Oregon, University of	Eugene, Oregon	Donald M. DuShane,
		Dir. of Student
		Affairs
Pacific, College of the	Stockton 27, Calif.	Edward S. Betz
Park College	Parkville, Missouri	Edward M. Carter

APPENDIX E (Continued)

Parsons College	Fairfield, Iowa	Philip E. Young, Dean of Students
Pennsylvania State College	State College, Pa.	H. K. Wilson Daniel A. DeMarino, Assistant Dean
Pittsburgh, University of	Pittsburgh 13, Pa.	Theodore W. Biddle
Princeton University	Princeton, New Jersey	Francis R.B. Godolphin
Principia, The	Elsah, Illinois	Garner E. Hubbell
Puerto Rico, University of	Mayaguez, Puerto Rico	Jose A. Franceschini, Dir. of Student Services
Purdue University	Lafayette, Indiana	George E. Davis, Dir. of Student Affairs
Redlands, Univ. of	Redlands, California	Don Mallett
Rhode Island State College	Kingston, Rhode Island	Mark Jack Smith John F. Quinn
Ripon College	Ripon, Wisconsin	Morris Quint
Rochester, The Univ. of	Rochester, New York	Philip Price, Director
Rollins College	Winter Park, Florida	A. D. Enyart
Rutgers University	New Brunswick, N. J.	Cornelius B. Boocock Edgar G. Curtin, Associate Dean
St. Lawrence Univ.	Canton, New York	George K. Brown
St. Olaf College	Northfield, Minnesota	Carl Swanson
Santa Barbara College	Santa Barbara, Cal.	Will Hayes
South Dakota, Univ. of	Vermillion, S. Dak.	R. H. Knapp
Southeastern Louisiana College	Hammond, Louisiana	L. E. Chandler
Southern California, University of	Los Angeles, Cal.	Bernie Hyink, Dean of Students
Southern Illinois Univ.	Carbondale, Illinois	I. Clark Davis
Southern Methodist University	Dallas 5, Texas	Willis Tate, Dean of Students
Southwestern La. Inst.	Lafayette, Louisiana	
Stanford University	Stanford U., Cal.	Lawrence A. Kimpton, Dean of Students
Stetson University, John B.	DeLand, Florida	Benson W. Davis
Stevens Institute of Technology	Hoboken, New Jersey	Waldo Shumway
Swarthmore College	Swarthmore, Pa.	Everett Hunt
Syracuse University	Syracuse 10, New York	Frank Piskor
Temple University	Philadelphia 22, Pa.	A. Blair Knapp, Dean of Students
Tennessee, University of	Knoxville, Tennessee	R. E. Dunford

APPENDIX E (Continued)

Texas College of Arts & Industry	Kingsville, Texas	
Texas Tech. College	Lubbock, Texas	James G. Allen
Texas, University of	Austin 12, Texas	Arno Nowotny, Dean of Student Life
		Jack Holland
Toledo, University of	Toledo 6, Ohio	Donald S. Parks, Personnel Director
Tulane University	New Orleans, La.	John H. Stibbs, Dir. of Student Life
Tulsa, The University of	Tulsa 4, Oklahoma	Clyde E. Blocker, Counselor to Men
Union College	Lincoln, Nebraska	M. S. Culver
Union College	Schenectady 8, N. Y.	C. W. Huntley
Utah State Agricultural College	Logan, Utah	Daryl Chase, Dean of Students
Utah, University of	Salt Lake City 1, Ut.	John L. Ballif, Jr.
Valparaiso University	Valparaiso, Indiana	Marshall J. Jox, Dean of Student Personnel
Vanderbilt University	Nashville, Tennessee	Robert S. Waldrop, Dean of Students
		Albert S. Thompson, Chief of Counselors
Vermont, University of	Burlington, Vermont	Rolf N. B. Haugen, Acting Dean
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	Blacksburg, Virginia	Robert E. Bates, Dir. of Student Affairs
Virginia, Univ. of	Charlottesville, Va.	
Washington & Lee University	Lexington, Virginia	Frank J. Gilliam, Dean of Students
Washington, State College of	Pullman, Washington	Norman E. Lange, Dean of Student Affairs
Washington University	St. Louis 5, Missouri	Arno J. Haack, Dir. of Student Affairs
Washington, University of	Seattle 5, Washington	Glen T. Nygreen, Exec. Office of Stu. Affairs
Wayne University	Detroit 1, Mich.	Victor F. Spathelf, Dean of Stu. Affairs
Western Reserve Univ.	Cleveland 6, Ohio	Russell A. Griffin
Western Michigan College of Education	Kalamazoo, Michigan	Ray C. Pellett
West Virginia Univ.	Morgantown, W. Va.	Joseph C. Gluck
Wheaton College	Wheaton, Illinois	Charles C. Brooks, Dean of Students
William & Mary, Col. of	Williamsburg, Va.	John E. Hocutt
Wisconsin, The University of	Madison 6, Wisconsin	Paul L. Trump
		Kenneth Little, Dir. Student Personnel Serv.

APPENDIX E (Continued)

Wittenberg College	Springfield, Ohio	John N. Stauffer, Dean of Students
Wooster, College	Wooster, Ohio	Judson G. Rosebush, Jr.
Wyoming, University of	Laramie, Wyoming	A. L. Keeney
Brigham Young University	Provo, Utah	Wesley P. Lloyd, Dean of Students

EMERITUS DEANS

Joseph A. Bursley, 2107 Hill Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan
 B. C. Daly, Box 755, Laramie, Wyoming
 Floyd Field, 2685 Tupelo Street, S. E., Atlanta 3, Georgia
 Christian Gauss, 24 Bayard Lane, Princeton, New Jersey
 Scott H. Goodnight, 2526 Norwood Place, Madison 5, Wisconsin
 T. T. Jones, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky
 Fraser Metzger, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey
 A. Ray Warnock, Pennsylvania State College, State College,
 Pennsylvania

HONORARY MEMBERS

Mr. H. Roe Bartle, Land Bank Building, Kansas City, Missouri